

sm

A 2

R E P L Y  
TO  
Mr. LAW's *Earnest* and  
*Serious* A N S W E R  
(As it is Called)  
TO  
Dr. TRAPP's  
DISCOURSE  
OF THE  
*Folly, Sin, and Danger*  
OF  
Being R I G H T E O U S O V E R - M U C H .

---

By JOSEPH TRAPP, D. D.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for L. GILLIVER, at *Homer's Head*,  
against *St. Dunstan's Church* in *Fleet-*  
*street.* 1741.  
( Price One Shilling and Six-pence. )

A  
R E P L Y

TO

Mr. Law's Answer and  
Answer to his  
(as it is called)

TO

Dr. Traill's

D I S C O U R S E

OF THE

True and False



Long Right

By JOSEPH TRAILL, D.D.

L O N D O N

Printed for J. Gutteridge, at the  
Printers, in the Strand, in 1794.  
(Price One Shilling and Sixpence)





A  
R E P L Y

T O  
Mr. LAW'S *Earnest and Se-*  
*rious* ANSWER, &c.

I  
T is now upwards of seven  
and thirty Years, since I  
have been a Preacher; and  
I hoped, and still do hope,  
that in all that Time I was,  
and still am, doing some Ser-  
vice to the Cause of Religion, of true Piety,  
and Vertue, according to the Precepts, the  
*strictest* Precepts of Christ, and his Apo-  
stles. God knows This was, and is, my  
Design; for the Success I cannot answer.  
Yet Now, at last, if you will believe some  
late Writers, I am running down all Chri-  
stian Vertue; and patronizing all manner  
A of

of Vice and Wickedness. This is a very heavy Charge; but, God be prais'd, it is not a true one. For *what Reason* am I thus accused? Why, because I have preached, and published a Discourse against *Excesses*, and *Madness* in Religion; occasioned by the Appearance of a *new Sect* of *Enthusiasts*, or *Hypocrites*, or *Both*; whose *Doctrines* and *Practises* tend to the Destruction of Souls, are a Scandal to Christianity, and expose it to the Scoffs of Libertines, Infidels, and Atheists. This is my Crime: For This I have been represented as an Encourager of Vice in *Others*, and as a Profligate *Myself*; as a *Profligate* both in *Principles*, and *Practise*; as a perfect *Debauchee*; as NO CHRISTIAN. I desire All who *are* Christians to consider This a little; and to judge *what Sort of Christians* THEY are (whatever they may talk of *Christian Perfection*) who in so shameful a Manner defame a *Minister of Christ*, only for doing his Duty in the regular Discharge of his holy Function. Six *Anonymous* Pamphlets, and a Seventh *with a Name*, such a Name as it is, have been publish'd to outrage and vilify me upon This Occasion; The Folly, and Falshoods, the Rudeness, Insolence, and Malice of them being such, as, I believe, were scarce ever before seen in any *Christian*, or even *Civiliz'd Nation*. This has been abundantly

dantly shewn in an *Answer* to them *All* : which was proper, in order to prevent the Mischief they might occasion ; tho' at the same time it did them, and their Authors, more Honour than they deserved.

That I should be thus insulted by a Fanatical Apostate from the Church of *England*, or by nameless Scribblers of Pamphlets, a Jumble of Methodists, Papists, Quakers, and Deists, was a Thing not much to be wonder'd at : But from so *grave*, and *religious* a Writer, as Mr. LAW, I might have expected a very different Sort of Treatment. And yet *his* Pamphlet, (which makes an Eighth, publish'd against That Discourse of Mine) so far as it goes with regard to the *Doctrine* I have taught, is in *Misrepresentation*, and *gross Falshoods*, in *Calumny*, and *Slander*, little, if at all, inferior to the rest : not to mention that *Spirit of Malignity*, which breathes through the whole Piece. There is indeed *not one Passage*, which he quotes from my Sermons, *truly represented* by him ; but *every thing* is utterly *falsify'd*, and *perverted*. Did he *know* this ? or did he *not* ? If he did *not* ; where is his *Judgment* ? If he *did* ; what are we to think of his *Honesty*, and *Conscience* ? Or are *Uncharitableness*, and the most flagrant *Injustice*, *false Accusation*, and *Defamation*, no Sins in This, or That Man ; because he talks

A 2

much,

much, and in a Strain of more than ordinary Godliness, about *Jesus Christ*, the *Love of God*, *Regeneration*, *Self-denial*, and *Christian Perfection*? They are so much the worse, I should think; and I believe all sober, and judicious Christians will be of the same Opinion. This Gentleman, p. 3. speaks of the SPIRIT OF GOD representing things to his Mind. Did That Spirit represent to him, that he ought to misrepresent Me, and abuse me, as he has done? Not so, I am sure: He who can allow himself in such Practises, is so far from having the Spirit of God in an extraordinary Way, (as Those Words seem to import) that he *resists*, and *grieves* him, even with respect to his ordinary Influences, and Operations.

Not content to explode my *Doctrine*, and pervert the plain Meaning of my *Words*, he passes Sentence upon my *very Thoughts*; my *Design*, and *Intention*. "Had he done this (says he, p. 19.) he had prevented the *Snare*, and *Deceit*, that is now in his Assertion: But then he would at the same time have made it *useless*, and *insignificant* to the DESIGN of his Discourse; and would have left a Door open for such *Advances of Piety*, as he is here opposing." The DESIGN of my Discourse (if you will believe Him) was to hinder *Advances in Piety*. If so; what a Wretch must



must I be? If otherwise; what is He? But suppose it were so; how does He *know* it? Might I not be *mistaken*; and teach *false Doctrine* without *designing* it? Does the *Spirit of God* so far *represent things* to This Man, as to make him a *Searcher of Hearts*? I do not judge so uncharitably of HIS *Design*; tho' I think he has taught much *false Doctrine*.

Could he think that his adding, in his Title Page, the Epithets *Earnest*, and *Serious* to the Word ANSWER, would justify his doing me all this Injury? Or that he injured me at all the less, because he did it *earnestly*, and *seriously*?

Could he think that his saying \* he enter'd upon this *Undertaking* with *great Reluctance*, because it might make him *seem at least in some degree unkind* to the Person he should *oppose*; that he has "no-thing more deeply riveted in his Heart, than an universal Love and Kindness for all Mankind, and more especially for Those whom God has called to be his Fellow-Labourers in promoting the Salvation of Mankind;" that he would write *under the Direction of Charity*, saying *nothing in the Spirit of an Adversary*; Could he think, I say, that his *affirming* all This would signify any thing, when the *Reverse* is *manifest* to every Reader? When  
he

\* P. 2, 3.

he not only calumniates *me* in the most spiteful manner; but casts so many vile Reflections upon the *Clergy in general*, with regard to their Lives and Conversation, the Discharge of their Duty in the Cure of Souls, *Pluralities*, &c. which *last-mention'd*, by the way, tho' perpetually rail'd at, as they ever have been, by the Enemies of our Ecclesiastical Establishment, have been often prov'd to be (if *duly regulated*, and *not abused*, as I confess they sometimes are) both *lawful*, and *expedient*: Particularly, by the great Mr. *Hooker* \*, and Mr. *Wharton* †: Whose *Reasons* FOR them will ever have more Weight with all *reasonable Men*, and *good Christians*, than a thousand *unproved Assertions*, *Invectives*, and *Declamations* AGAINST them.

I certainly gave This Gentleman no *personal Provocation*; unless *presuming to differ from him* in Opinion may be so accounted. It is true, I always thought his *Treatise upon Christian Perfection* to be one of the most *pernicious Books* that has been publish'd in This Age; and could not but lament our hard Lot, that while we are combating *Debauchery*, *Infidelity*, and *Atheism* on the one Hand, we should be pester'd with *Enthusiasm*, and *Frenzy in Religion*, on the other. When it first appeared in the World, I said I fear'd it

\* Eccles. Polit. B. V. § 81. † Defence of Pluralities.

it would do a great deal of Mischief; and so, I am well assur'd, *it has*. When the Sect of *Methodists* first started up, I imputed it very much to *That Book*; and so did Others, as well as I. Accordingly, the Leaders of those Enthusiasts extol it to the Skies: Mr. Law's *Christian Perfection*, and his *Serious Call* are worth their Weight in Gold, &c. But because I dislike his *Treatise upon Christian Perfection*; am I therefore an Enemy to *Christian Perfection itself*? Or do I dissuade Christians from *aspiring after it*, and *endeavouring to attain it*? I never preached such Doctrine; but have often preached the contrary. In This *very Discourse* which we are now considering, I have insisted upon *as much Piety*, as the *strictest* Precepts of the Gospel require; And is not That *enough*? I am not against *extraordinary* and *uncommon Vertue*, (as This Writer falsely represents me) but against *That* which, being CALLED *extraordinary Vertue*, is INDEED *Vice*. To explain This farther, (if it be not plain enough already) I will borrow a few Words from the *Answer* \* before-mention'd. " This Author, like the rest of  
" them,

\* The True Spirit of the Methodists and their Allies, &c. fully laid open in an ANSWER to † Six of the Seven Pamphlets (Mr. Law's being reserved to be considered by itself) lately publish'd against Dr. Trapp's Sermons upon *being Righteous over-much*.

† It should have been Seven of the Eight.

“ them, all along confounds being too  
 “ good *strictly*, and *literally*, with being  
 “ so *loosely*, and *improperly speaking*; and  
 “ *over-much Righteousness* with *Christian*  
 “ *Perfection*. He represents the Doctor as  
 “ being an Enemy to *extraordinary De-*  
 “ *grees* of Virtue; because he is so to *Ex-*  
 “ *traordinaries*, and *Excesses*, which are  
 “ *Deviations FROM Virtue*.”

Mr. LAW has these Words, p. 3. “ The  
 “ *Text*, from which he has the Title of  
 “ his Discourse, is very *unhappily chosen*,  
 “ &c. As the Royal Preacher sometimes  
 “ introduces *Fools*, and *Infidels* making  
 “ their Speeches; so *there is a NECES-*  
 “ *SITY* of supposing That to be the Case  
 “ in the Doctor’s Text, not only from  
 “ the Context—but because the Words,  
 “ unless stripp’d of all their proper Mean-  
 “ ing, CANNOT be taken in a Sense that is  
 “ tolerable, or consistent with the common  
 “ Notions of Piety.” All this is *gratis*  
*dictum*, mere *Saying* without *Proving*.  
 The Choice of the Text has been abundantly  
 vindicated, and the Sense of it fully  
 cleared, in the Pamphlet just now mention’d  
 \* (to which I refer) against another Wri-  
 ter; if he be another: For his Assertions  
 without Proofs, upon This Article, are so  
 exactly the same with Mr. LAW’s in This  
 Place; that one would think they were HIS  
 OWN. P.

\* *True Spirit*, &c. P. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.



P. 4. "Is it not therefore *strange* that  
 " the Doctor should chuse, &c. Is it not  
 " *strange* that he should think it right and  
 " just, &c. Is it not still *stranger* that  
 " such a Text so offensive to Piety, &c."  
 All these suppos'd *strange things* are not  
 strange at all. He proceeds upon a false  
 Supposition that he has *proved* what he be-  
 fore *asserted*: Whereas we have only *his*  
*Word* for it; He has *prov'd nothing*, but  
*beg'd the Question*: Which is *perpetually* his  
 Way of *Arguing*, or rather *not Arguing*.  
 His Taunt upon the *Doctor's three Church-*  
*es*, as he calls them, shall pass without any  
 Reflection of mine. But what he means by  
 This Text's being "sent abroad into the  
 " Christian World, as a proper *Key* to ALL  
 " the *practical Sayings, Parables, and*  
 " *Doctrines of Jesus Christ*," I cannot  
 imagine: I am sure I say no such thing in  
 my Sermons, nor any thing like it.

P. 4, 5.—"What he calls the *baneful*  
 " *Plague of Enthusiasm*." What Occasion  
 was there for This Carping? Are not *bane-*  
*ful*, and *Plague* good *English Words*? And  
 does not *Enthusiasm* deserve That Character?  
 I think it does; but He, for a *plain Rea-*  
*son*, may be *more tender* of it, than I am.

P. 5. "But then it is Matter of just  
 " Complaint, that he does all this without  
 " ever shewing in any Part of his Discourse  
 " wherein true Righteousness, or the right,  
 B " and

“ and sober Spirit of Piety consists.” That is, it is Matter of just Complaint, that in discoursing upon *one* Point of Religion, I did not discourse upon *others*. Besides; Treating of *one* Extreme, That in *Excess*, as my main, and direct Subject, to prevent Mistakes, I carefully guard against the *other*, That in *Defect*; nay expressly assert That to be the *more dangerous* of the two. ~~From~~ all which put together, it may be in a great measure collected, “ wherein true  
 “ Righteousness, or the right, and sober  
 “ Spirit of Piety consists.”

*Ibid.* “ If he supposed his Readers to be  
 “ already well acquainted with the Nature,  
 “ and Extent of Christian Holiness, &c.”  
*What* Readers? Some *are* so acquainted;  
 and some *not*.—“ There would then have  
 “ been little Occasion for his present Un-  
 “ dertaking. For if they be supposed  
 “ thus to know what is right in Religion;  
 “ they would by such Knowledge be in  
 “ the best State of Security against that  
 “ which is wrong.” Doubtless those who  
 know what is right are most likely to know  
 what is wrong. But are *all* of equal Ca-  
 pacity? If my Readers want no Instruc-  
 tion, so much the better: If they do; they  
 may from my Discourse be instructed in  
*some Things*, tho’ not in *every Thing*.

“ But the Doctor OVERLOOKS *this im-  
 “ portant Matter*: He neither supposes  
 “ them

“ them to have This Knowledge; nor endeavour to help them to it.” This is sufficiently answered by what I have said already. “ But in a Flow of Zeal——” Why, is not *Zeal a good Thing*; if it be in a *good Cause*, and according to *Knowledge*? And has He proved *mine* not to be such? “ In a loose, declamatory Stile——” I have a very indifferent Opinion of my Stile (as of every thing else) in This, and all other my mean Performances. But whatever Faults it may have, to say it is *loose*, or *declamatory*, is plainly false: This indeed is exactly the Character of *his own* Writings; but the very Reverse of mine! I appeal to the World for the Truth of Both. “ —Re-  
 “ flects at large upon *all Attempts* to-  
 “ wards a Piety, that is not *modern, com-*  
 “ *mon*, and according to the *present Power*,  
 “ and *Fashion* of *Religion* in the World.” As gross a *Falshood*, and *Slander*, as ever was spoken, or written: And so is *every thing* he says that affects me for ten Pages together; P. 6, 7, &c. to p. 16. I will point out the Passages; and tho’ to point them out be to answer them sufficiently, I will do something more.

P. 6. “ But *no where* a WORD, or a  
 “ HINT in Favour of Those, who would  
 “ *not only* [what this *not only* means I  
 “ know not] be so *excessive*, so *extraor-*  
 “ *dinary*, and so much out of the *common*

“ *Paths*, as the blessed Saints, and Mar-  
 “ tyrs of the Primitive Church were: No  
 “ where are such People told that he wishes  
 “ them *Godspeed*—No where are such  
 “ People told that he writes not against  
 “ *Them*, that he *loves* their *Spirit*, and  
 “ should be glad to *add* new Fervours to  
 “ it.” They are not told so in *his Words*,  
 ’tis true: But they are *in Effect* told so in  
*mine*. I shall refer to the Passages here-  
 after. “ No where are they told what  
 “ *Christian Perfection* is.” The Reason  
 is, I *was not writing about* Christian Per-  
 fection. However; I *recommend* Christian  
 Perfection; if living up to the *strictest* Pre-  
 cepts of the Gospel may be called so: And  
 for the same Reason I recommend such *ex-*  
*traordinary* true *Piety* as was That of the  
 blessed Saints, and Martyrs of the Primi-  
 tive Church. P. 7. “ Who to the World  
 “ *dead in Trespasses and Sin*, preaches up  
 “ the *Sin, Folly*, and Danger of being  
 “ *righteous over-much*.” To Those who  
 are (tho’ I hope not *dead*) in *Trespasses*,  
 and *Sins*, on the *Excessive* Side, I indeed  
 Thus preach: But That is no *Encourage-*  
*ment* to Those who are *dead in Trespasses*,  
 and *Sins*, on the *Defective* Side; whom I  
 often, and earnestly warn of their extreme  
 Danger. “ To the World, *eating, and drinking*,  
 “ *and rising up to play*, he harangues upon  
 “ the



“ the Danger, Madness, and Folly of too  
 “ much Temperance, Abstinence, Mortifi-  
 “ cation, and Severity of Life.” When I  
 thus *harangue*, (as he is pleas’d to call it)  
 I do not *harangue* to That Part of the  
 World which is *eating, and drinking, and*  
*rising up to play*: To them I *harangue* in  
 another Manner, and from quite different  
 Topicks. “ To the World *asleep, insensi-*  
 “ *ble, and careless*, not only of the Puri-  
 “ ty, and Perfection, but of the first Prin-  
 “ ciples of the Gospel, he *boldly, rashly,*  
 “ reproaches all Appearances of Holiness,  
 “ that are *uncommon, and extraordinary.*”  
 For the Sophistry in Those Words *uncom-*  
*mon, and extraordinary*, I desire the Rea-  
 der to see backwards, p. 7, 8. That being  
 cleared; This Assertion is absolutely false,  
 and slanderous. He here accuses me of  
*Boldness, and Rashness*, two Crimes of a  
 considerable Magnitude in Matters of Reli-  
 gion, and Divinity: And if I am *not*  
 guilty of them, He *is*; who Thus *boldly,*  
*and rashly*, lays them to my Charge. P. 8.  
 “ This therefore I am OBLIGED to point  
 “ out, as a *fundamental Defect* in the  
 “ Doctor’s Discourse; and such as renders  
 “ it an *evil Temptation, a dangerous Snare,*  
 “ and *fatal Delusion* to all who do not read  
 “ it with a full, and thorough Dislike.”  
 Strong Words, I confess; but the stronger,  
 the worse, if they are not *true*: And *how*  
*true*

*true* they are, we have partly seen already ; and partly shall see hereafter. *Fortiter calumniare*, is a Saying indeed ; but 'tis a bad one : And how this Gentleman was *obliged*, by what Dictate of *Christian Perfection*, or even the *lowest Degree* of Christianity, he was *obliged to write*, and *publish* all This *Calumny* against me, who neither by Word or Deed ever in the least injur'd him, I am wholly at a Loss to conceive.

In what follows he mentions *several Sorts* of Persons, upon whom (according to Him) my Doctrine is like to have an ill Effect. " Coldness, and Indifferency, (p. 8, 9.) and a lifeless outward Compliance " with the Duties of Religion, a Slavery " to Ease, Softness, and sensible Pleasures, " &c. is perhaps the State of more than " two Thirds of Those who are look'd " upon to be the Religious amongst us. " Now the Doctor's Discourse has a *direct*, " and *natural Fitness* to lull all these Peo- " ple asleep, to suppress all Stirrings, and " Intentions of Amendment, &c. There " is scarce a Reader amongst this *Number* " of People, whether he be *Layman*, or " *Clergyman*, [I should have wonder'd if " that *last Word* had been omitted] but " will find This Effect from the Doctor's " Instructions ; He will begin to take " fresh Comfort in his State, &c." This  
is

is *totally false*; as appears from what I have said above. And I here observe to my Reader, once for all, concerning my *et cætera's* and *Breaks*, in my Quotations from him, both in what goes before, and in what is to follow, that he loads me with much more Scandal than That which I transcribe, (it would be a *fatiguing* Task indeed to transcribe it *all*) *declaiming* against me in such a manner; that, if what he says be true, I must be as vile a Miscreant, as very an Agent of the Devil, as most that ever breath'd. "Again \* (says he) others there are—whose Consciences are greatly awaken'd——[and who " in short desire] to *be perfect, even as " their Father which is in Heaven is perfect.*" † " But now how does the Doctor deal with THIS SORT OF PEOPLE?—" Why truly he considers THEM as a *deduced, weak, or hypocritical, or half-thinking* People; that disturb the Christian Church with their Projects about Perfection.—He ridicules, and exposes *every Step* THEY must take in their intended Progress, by adding Absurdities of his own Invention to it. There is nothing for SUCH PEOPLE throughout his *WHOLE DISCOURSE*, but *Reproaches, Ridicule, and Discouragement.*" Not one Word of Truth in all This, but the direct Contrary; as appears again from what has

\* P. 9, 10.

† P. 11.

been

been already said, and will be said in the Sequel. \* “ Are they desirous of all that  
 “ *Self-denial*, all that *Mortification* of bodily Appetites, and sensual Passions, as  
 “ may *best fit* them to be Temples of the  
 “ Holy Spirit? He ridicules THEM as  
 “ holding the Sinfulness of *smelling a Rose*.” That is, Because I say, that, according to  
 the Doctrine of some Righteous over-much, it is sinful to *smell a Rose*; THEREFORE I  
 ridicule THOSE who are desirous of such *Self-denial*, and *Mortification*, as may *best fit them* to be Temples of the Holy Spirit.  
 What a Consequence is This! † “ Do they  
 “ begin to discover the deep Corruption of  
 “ their Nature, the Superficialness, and  
 “ Weakness of their Vertues? &c. He  
 “ tells THEM the great Enemy of Souls  
 “ adapts his Temptations to all Sorts of  
 “ Tempers—Those who are dispos’d to be  
 “ good, and vertuous, if he cannot prevail  
 “ with them to be vicious, commonly so  
 “ call’d, he labours to make them over-  
 “ vertuous, that is, vicious, tho’ not com-  
 “ monly so call’d; and so involves them in  
 “ Dangers, and Mischiefs.” To pass over  
 a Piece of false English which he here puts  
 upon me, and of which I am innocent;  
 How do I apply This to THEM, who begin  
 to discover the deep Corruption of their  
 Nature, &c. and (as he goes on) “ to fear  
 “ they

\* P. 12.

† Ibid.



“ they have as yet scarce come up to the  
 “ Righteousness of the Scribes, and Pha-  
 “ risees.” I speak This to the *World in*  
*general*; tho’ what I say *more particular-*  
*ly* affects Those who are *Righteous over-*  
*much*, or in Danger of being so. And do  
 I any where say that to *discover the Cor-*  
*ruptions of our Nature, &c.* is to be *Righ-*  
*teous over-much*? My Words, at my Pro-  
 ceeding to the Head under which This Pas-  
 sage occurs, are These—*In the third Place*  
*to shew the dangerous Tendency—of being*  
 RIGHTEOUS OVER-MUCH. To This I stick;  
 This I all along have in my Eye: Speak-  
 ing *to the Purpose*, and speaking *Sense*:  
 Not (as he does in his *Christian Perfec-*  
*tion*, his Pamphlet about *Regeneration*,  
 and *This against Me*) making my Discourse  
 a *loose Rope of Sand*, a *Rhapsody of No-*  
*body knows what*; *confounding very*  
*distinct Things*; and *throwing about Words*  
 without *Connection, Method, or Meaning*.

\* “ Are they such as are ONLY desirous  
 “ of reforming THEIR OWN Lives——  
 “ and wholly intent upon THEIR OWN Ad-  
 “ vancement in MERELY practical Piety?”  
 [The Words *only*, and *merely* come in  
 strangely here: The Latter I did not men-  
 tion; and gave no Occasion for his Appli-  
 cation of the Former, (as will appear im-  
 mediately) any more than I did for the  
 Words *their own*, which he *twice* makes

\* Ibid.

C

use

use of.] “ To THESE he shews that THEY  
 “ are in the *very Paths* that lead and al-  
 “ ways did lead, to *Fanatick Madness.*”  
 How so I pray? Why he quotes These  
 Words of mine. “ *To what a Height of*  
 “ *Fanatick Madness in Doctrine, as well*  
 “ *as Practise, are some advanc'd who set*  
 “ *out at first with an APPEARANCE of*  
 “ *more than ordinary Sanctity in Practise*  
 ONLY?” So that because I said, Some *Righ-*  
*teous over-much*, (for of *them*, and *them only*  
 I was speaking) who set out at first with a  
 more than ordinary *Appearance* of Sanctity  
 in *Practise* ONLY, are now advanced to a  
 great Height of *Fanatick Madness in Doc-*  
*trine*, as well as *Practise*; THEREFORE I  
 shew Those who are ONLY desirous of re-  
 forming their OWN LIVES, &c. that THEY  
 are in the *very Paths* that lead, and al-  
 ways did lead, to *Fanatick Madness.* Let  
 the Reader observe too that in his Repre-  
 sentation of my Sense, when I say the AP-  
 PEARANCE of *Sanctity*, he drops the Word  
*Appearance*, (tho' He himself afterwards  
 quotes it;) as if That went for nothing;  
 as if *Sanctity*, and the *Appearance* of Sanc-  
 tity were all one. Whatever He may  
 think, I assure him I am of a very diffe-  
 rent Opinion. He then quotes me Thus.  
 “ And again I do say that in all Ages En-  
 “ *thusiasts have been Righteous over-much*;  
 “ *they began with the last-mention'd, and*  
 “ ended

“ ended with the other. And is it not so  
 “ now ?” THEREFORE I *shew* THOSE who  
 are desirous of reforming, &c. that THEY  
 are in the very Paths, &c. as Before. I  
 might observe that as This Gentleman al-  
 ways perverts and misrepresents the main  
 Substance of my *Sense*; so Here, and in  
 several other Places, he *misquotes* my very  
*Words*, even when, to serve any Purpose,  
 there was no Occasion for it. Perhaps he  
 thought it *beneath* him to trouble himself  
 with *exactly transcribing* them. By his  
*magisterial* way of treating me, one would  
 think so indeed.

In his Animadversion upon the next Pas-  
 sage which he quotes from me, I must *dis-*  
*tinguish* between the *several Expressions* he  
 makes use of. \* “ Farther, are there Others  
 “ who—hunger and thirst after the *Mani-*  
 “ *festation* of the Divine Life in them, de-  
 “ siring that Christ may be wholly *formed*  
 “ in them, that they may *put on* Christ,  
 “ be in him *new Creatures*, led by his Spi-  
 “ rit, *growing* in him, as Branches in the  
 “ Vine, and tasting in the inward Man  
 “ the Powers of the World to come? For  
 “ SUCH AS THESE the Doctor has this In-  
 “ struction: *That there is* (says he) *such a*  
 “ *Thing as the Operation, and Influence of*  
 “ *the Holy Spirit upon our Souls, &c. is*  
 “ *not only granted, but insisted upon—*  
 G 2 “ But

“ *But what Reason, what Scripture is*  
 “ *there for This inward Seeing, Hearing,*  
 “ *Feeling ?*” To such as THESE, retaining  
 only the Expressions I have now cited, and  
 leaving out the rest, I do *not* give the In-  
 struction he refers to ; provided that by  
 Those Words the MANIFESTATION of the  
 Divine Life in them, be meant no more,  
 than their *perceiving*, upon a Survey of their  
 Actions, and by the Testimony of their  
 Conscience, that they have the Divine Life.  
 To such as THESE, I do not put the Ques-  
 tion, *What Reason, what Scripture ?* &c.  
 I allow as much *inward Feeling, Seeing,*  
 and *Hearing* as This amounts to ; if *in-*  
*ward Perceiving* must be called by those  
 Names : tho’ I think it is called so very  
*improperly*. But if we leave out Those  
 Expressions, and retain only These others  
 of his ; “ Who begin to FEEL the Mystery  
 “ of Redemption DISCOVER’D in their Souls ;  
 “ desiring that Christ may be wholly RE-  
 “ VEAL’D in them ; HEARING the Word of  
 “ God WRITTEN, and SPOKEN in THEIR  
 “ HEARTS ; in his Light seeing Light.”—  
 [Which last Words the Psalmist, I suppose,  
 meant of the *Beatic Vision* in the next  
 World, not of the *Light within* Men in  
 This ;] all which I take to be a Set of  
*Enthusiastick* Phrases, the Language of  
*Quietists, Bourignonists, and Quakers :*  
 To Such I think my Instruction would be  
 proper,



proper, and my *Question* properly put. Tho', after all, in my Discourse, I did not put it even to *Them*, (I used none of those Expressions) but to Persons, who, as I apprehended, imagine they have a greater Measure of the Spirit, than those Expressions seem to import. Upon the same Quotation he goes on in the very next Words. \* "According therefore to the Doctor's Divinity, both Reason, and Scripture REQUIRE, that the true Christian be inwardly blind, inwardly deaf, and void of ALL inward Feeling." I answer, First, It is one thing to say, that there is neither Reason nor Scripture FOR *such*, or *such* a Thing; and quite another to say that both Reason and Scripture REQUIRE the *Contrary*. 2dly, There is surely a *Medium* between a Man's being *extraordinarily inspir'd* by the Holy Spirit, (of which alone I was there speaking) and his being *inwardly blind*, and *deaf*, &c. Because I deny extraordinary Inspiration in This, or That Man, He having no *Evidence* for it, either from Reason, or Scripture; do I therefore say, that according to Both, he, or any other Christian, MUST BE void of ALL *inward Feeling*? The Feeling of a good, or bad *Conscience* is an *inward Feeling*, I think: And must a Christian needs be void of *such* Feeling; because he has not

not *divine Revelations*? He proceeds:  
 “ For if neither Scripture, nor Reason will  
 “ ALLOW of any *inward Senses*; then they  
 “ must both of them require an *inward In-*  
 “ *sensibility*.” But do I say that neither  
 Scripture, nor Reason allow of any *inward*  
*Senses*? (Tho’, by the way, I should ra-  
 ther say *inward Sense*, or *Sensibility*, than  
*inward Senses*.) *What Reason, what Scrip-*  
*ture* (say I) *is there for THIS inward See-*  
*ing*? &c. meaning such as is caus’d by the  
 EXTRAORDINARY Impulse of the Spirit, of  
 which only I was speaking. THEREFORE  
 (according to this Writer) I say, *Neither* of  
 them will ALLOW of ANY *inward Senses*.  
 “ But Scripture, from *Genesis* to the *Revela-*  
 “ *tions*, is full of Proof of these inward Sen-  
 “ *ses*.” And so he goes on in three Pages with  
 a *Declamation* about *Hardness of Heart*:  
 Which may be very *Rhetorical*, for aught  
 I know; but what is it *to the Purpose*?

P. 16. “ His further Instruction to THIS  
 “ SORT of People stands Thus. THEY are  
 “ told by him, that *their high Notions of*  
 “ *Spiritual Improvements* have this Effect:  
 “ On the one hand they lead to *Presump-*  
 “ *tion*, on the other to *Desperation*.” THIS  
 Sort of People—THEY—That is, the Peo-  
 ple he speaks of P. 13. as above quoted by  
 me, P. 19, 20. who *begin to feel*, &c. who  
*hunger and thirst*, &c. I have above dis-  
 tinguish’d *This* Sort of People into *two* Sorts;  
 according

according to the different Expressions he makes use of. But in the Passage he here cites from me, I do not speak of *Either* of them; but of Persons *Righteous over-much* consider'd barely in that Respect. My Words are, (P. 36.) *Now this over-much Righteousness, or Righteousness* falsely so call'd, *is apt to produce Presumption in some, Despair in others.* How can This be apply'd to Those who *really*, and in a Sense *truly* Christian, *hunger and thirst after Righteousness*, desiring to *put on Christ* &c. And as to *inward Light*, *inward Hearing*, and *Feeling*, and other *Enthusiastick* Notions, I had as yet said nothing about them. Take it which way you will; when he says they are TOLD by Me, that *their high Notions of Spiritual Improvements* have this Effect, &c. he puts those Words upon me; I have none such, nor any like them.

I said above, that tho' my chief Design (as my Subject led me) was to shew the Danger of Extremes on the *Excessive* Side; yet in many Places I carefully guard against the *Other*, That on the *Defective*; insisting upon as much *Strictness*, as the *Gospel requires*: When, according to this Writer's Account, (who, one would think, *answer'd* my Discourse without *reading* it) I have no where a WORD or a HINT sounding that Way. To prove the contrary, must

must I be at the Trouble of *transcribing* a considerable Part of my Sermons? That sure would be very unreasonable. I refer the Reader to P. 19, 24, 25. and to the three last Pages throughout.

Our Author proceeds. \* "*He has been told* (he says) *that some have been actually thrown into Despair. They have been made stark mad, and received into Bedlam, as such.* And then he cries out, *Was the Religion of Jesus Christ intended to make People mad? Is This for the Honour of Christianity?*" Upon this, he adds, † "*I shall only observe, that when our Saviour was upon Earth there were two Sorts of mad People about him. The one Sort ran about in Disorder, tore their Cloaths, and cut their own Flesh: the other Sort raved in Madness, threw Dust into the Air, and stopped their Ears, and cry'd out, crucify him, crucify him.* Now it may be ask'd which of these two Sorts of People were in the most disorder'd, and distemper'd State? Whose *Madness* was the most *shocking*; that of the *Lunatics*, or that of the *High Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees?*" I answer; These latter (to pass over those Circumstances of their *throwing Dust into the Air, and stopping their Ears*, which I have read of in the Persecution of St. Paul, and St.

\* P. 16.

† P. 17.



St. Stephen, but never in That of our Saviour) were not mad at all, in the *natural* Sense; and I spoke of no other. They were very wicked, if he pleases; but That is *moral*, not natural Madness. "To me  
 " the *Lunatics* seem to be in a *less Degree* of Disorder; and the Reason is this,  
 " because our Saviour could heal them, but  
 " not the High Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees." Now I think the *Lunatics* were more disorder'd in their *Understandings*, tho' the Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees were more so in their *Wills*: And our Saviour *could not* heal the latter, for no Reason, but because they *would not be healed*. He would not *force the Will*; tho' he work'd Miracles to cure Diseases, and cast out Devils. By the way, this Gentleman seems to represent Those as mere *Lunatics*, or *Madmen*, whom the Scripture represents as *Demoniacs*. Other late Writers indeed have done so; but I did not think *He* would. He goes on. "Now is  
 " it reasonable, on the account of the  
 " *Madness* of these *Priests, Scribes, and Doctors of the Law*, to say, Is this for  
 " the Honour of the *Jewish Law*? Was  
 " *the Law, and the Prophets intended to make People mad?*" No certainly; it is not reasonable: But what is This to Me? And how am I *oppos'd* by it? "Now if  
 " the Doctor knows how to excuse the  
 D " *Law*

“ *Law and the Prophets*, tho’ those great  
 “ Students of them were in such a despe-  
 “ rate State of *Phrensy*, and *Madness*—”  
 I say again they were in NO *Phrensy*, and  
*Madness* at all, in the *natural* Sense, which  
 is the only one I was speaking of. “ Then  
 “ Christianity may be blameless; tho’ here  
 “ and there a Christian may be fit for *Bed-*  
 “ *lam*.” Questionless it *may*; nay it cer-  
 tainly *is*: But what is This to *Me* again?  
 Have I said any thing to the contrary?  
 Why yes; I said that certain Doctrines  
 and Practises PRETENDED to be the *Height*,  
*and Perfection of Christianity*, but REALLY,  
 and IN TRUTH, *contrary to it*, have made  
 some People mad; which tends to the *Dis-*  
*honour of Christianity*: THEREFORE I said  
*Christianity itself* is blameable; because  
 here and there a Christian may be fit for  
*Bedlam*. Let the Reader carefully consi-  
 der what this Gentleman here writes about  
*Madness*, and *Bedlam*; and then ask him-  
 self whether the *Writer* does not seem to  
 be a little infected with the *Subject*.

Let him ask himself too what he takes  
 to be the *Meaning* of this pretty Allusion,  
 thus *unnaturally drag’d in* by our Author.  
 Is it not to compare *Me*, and the *rest of the*  
*Clergy*, who do not act, think, and teach  
 as *He* does, with the *Priests*, *Scribes*, and  
*Pharisees*, and Others who *crucify’d our*  
*Saviour*?

P. 18. " Again, are there others who  
 " desire to bring the whole Form of their  
 " Lives under Rules of Religion, to let the  
 " Spirit of the Gospel give Laws to the  
 " most ordinary Things and Enjoyments?  
 " &c." If by letting *the Spirit of the*  
*Gospel give Laws* to them be meant *regu-*  
*lating* them, and *using* them in *due measure*,  
 according to the *true Spirit*, and *Temper* of  
 the *Gospel*; I entirely approve of it, nay  
 insist that it is absolutely necessary. Those  
 who do this do no more than their Duty.  
 " These People are told by the Doctor,  
 " that *wholly abstaining from Things indif-*  
 " *ferent*"—Why THESE People again? I  
 am There stating the *Nature* of being  
*Righteous over-much*; shewing wherein it  
*consists*; and speaking to the World in *ge-*  
*neral*, not to one *particular* Sort of People.  
 Nor are Those, whom This Writer here de-  
 scribes, in the least blamed or discouraged  
 by the Words he cites from me; which are  
 These. *Wholly abstaining from Things*  
*indifferent, and innocent in themselves, as*  
*forbidden, and unlawful, is a signal In-*  
*stance of being Righteous over-much; and*  
*so on the other Hand, is making Things in-*  
*different to be necessary, and Matters of*  
*Duty.* Upon which, Thus \* our Author.  
 " What is here said has some Truth in it;  
 " and might be useful in its proper Place,

D 2

" and

“ and under right Limitations.” Now I think it was in as *proper a Place*, as could possibly be. I was shewing (as I just now said) wherein *over-much Righteousness* consists; and mention’d *This as one Instance* of it. What could be more *proper*, or more in *its Place*? As for the *right Limitations* which our Author would make, and which he supposes me *not* to make; we shall see *them* presently. “ But as it here “ stands (continues he) in the Doctor’s Dis- “ course, it is a *grievous Snare*, and *De- “ ceit to the Reader*.” And This *Snare*, and *Deceit* too was DESIGNED by me, according to what he says p. 19, “ Had he “ done This, he had prevented, &c.” which I quoted before, p. 4. And *why* all this? “ For it is to signify to him that *wholly “ abstaining* from Things, in themselves in- “ different and innocent, *cannot* be made a “ Matter of *true Religious* Advancement, “ but is a blameable Instance of Piety in “ Excess.” Put in the Words, *as forbid- den, and unlawful*, which I used, and which He himself quoted just before, but now leaves out; and I say it *cannot* be made a Matter of true Religious Advancement, but is a blameable Instance of Piety in Excess. “ If the Doctor had meant “ only to teach, that we should not wholly “ abstain from Things indifferent and inno- “ cent, as if they were *in themselves un- “ lawful*;



“ *lawful*; he should have told his Rea-  
 ders that he meant no more, &c.” Have  
 I not told them so in *express* Words?—  
*Abstaining from Things indifferent and in-*  
*nocent in themselves, as forbidden, and un-*  
*lawful.*——The Words in themselves  
 plainly relate not only to *innocent* which  
 goes before, but to *unlawful* which fol-  
 lows; so far as they can properly be ap-  
 ply’d to it: *as unlawful in themselves*;  
 that is, *as if* they were *forbidden* by some  
 Law of God, or Nature. Or suppose there  
 were no such Words as *in themselves* in the  
 whole Sentence; Is not *as forbidden, and*  
*unlawful* the same with *as in itself unlaw-*  
*ful*; the same in *Substance*, tho’ not exactly  
 in the same Expression? “ He should  
 “ have told them that such Things might  
 “ be abstain’d from *justly*, and *piously*, upon  
 “ a better Principle, &c. and that he did  
 “ not condemn the abstaining, &c. but  
 “ only when it was done from a *supersti-*  
 “ *tious* Notion of the Things being in  
 “ *themselves sinful*, &c.” This last I do in  
 effect say; as I have shewn. For the rest;  
 HE SHOULD HAVE TOLD THEM—says my  
 dogmatical Instructor. But by what Law  
 was I then obliged to tell them every thing  
 that he now says I ought to have told them?  
 I said what was sufficient for my Purpose;  
 and to have added what he so positively  
 dictates,

dictates, would have been immethodical, and impertinent.

What he says from the Bottom of the 19th Page to the Bottom of the 23d is partly true, but nothing to the Point; as not affecting me, who never deny'd it: Partly, I think, not true; but I have no more to do with it, than any body else; and therefore shall not trouble myself about it. I only observe, that had a Quaker, or an Infidel been Author of This *earnest, and serious Answer*; he could not well have reflected with more Virulency upon the *Clergy of our Church*, than in these Expressions. "How ought every one to be  
 "frighted at the Thought of desiring, or  
 "seeking a *second Living*, or of rejoicing  
 "at great PAY, where there is but *little*  
 "Duty!" \* "It is look'd upon as lawful  
 "to get *several Preferments*; and to make  
 "a *Gain of the Gospel* by *HIRING* others  
 "to do Duty for us at a *lower Rate*——  
 "It is look'd upon as lawful for the Clergy  
 "to live in *State*, and *Equipage*, to *buy*  
 "*Purple, and fine Linen*, out of the Re-  
 "venues of the Church, &c." With  
 much more to the same Purpose. "But  
 "now *supposing* all this to be *lawful*, &c."  
 † Reflections, cast upon them, without any  
 manner of Ground from Reason, or Scrip-  
 ture; as I could easily prove: But it is  
 no

\* P. 21.

† P. 22.

no more my Business, than any other Clergyman's. And besides it is needless; all these, and many more Invectives against the Clergy, and the Provision made for them (which God knows is, in the main, little enough) having been long since fully answer'd.

P. 23. " But since the Doctor has not look'd at this Matter, &c. he can't well be excus'd from that *Half-thinking* which he so much reproaches in others." That is, I am a *Half-Thinker*; because I have not SAID *every thing*, whether to the Purpose, or not, ABOUT *every thing* I had occasion to mention; and because I do not multiply Words, just as He is pleased to prescribe.

P. 24. " But I must farther observe, that there is yet more of *Snare*, and *Deception*, in what the Doctor has here said of This Matter. For the Reader may thereby be easily brought into a Belief that Things in themselves indifferent, and innocent are not the *proper Subjects* of Religion, or *Means* of advancing in Piety." How so? Does it follow that because Things *in themselves indifferent* and *innocent*, are not to be abstain'd from, as *forbidden*, and *unlawful*; therefore they are not [*in any respect*] the proper Subjects of Religion, or Means of advancing in Piety?—" And that he need not bring  
" himself

“ himself under *any Laws* of Religion, concerning such Things. Whereas nothing  
 “ can be more contrary to Truth, or more  
 “ hurtful to his Piety, than such a Belief.”  
 How do my Words *so much as intimate*  
 that he need not bring himself under *any Laws of Religion* concerning such Things?  
 There are doubtless many Laws of Religion relating to them; that is, to the *sober*,  
 and *temperate* Use of them with regard to *Ourselves*; and the *charitable* Use of them  
 with regard to *Others*, as in the Case of avoiding *Scandal*, or giving Offence to weak  
 Brethren. And do I affirm any thing to the  
 Contrary; because I affirm, that being innocent and indifferent *in themselves*, they  
 ought not to be *wholly* abstain’d from *as forbidden* and *unlawful*? This Writer  
 Himself makes the Distinction; and pretends I did *not* make it, which I have  
 shewn to be false. He *supposes* me to say just what *he pleases*, contrary to my *plain Words*; then upon That Supposition goes on *declaiming*, and reviling me.

P. 24—29. “ *Eating, Drinking, Sleeping, Dressing, Resting, Labour, Conversation, Trade, Diversion, and Money* are  
 “ in themselves indifferent, innocent, and  
 “ useful. But it is in the religious, or ir-  
 “ religious Use of these Things, that some  
 “ People *live* up to the Spirit of the Gospel, and others *wholly die* to it.” Upon  
 This



This Subject he spends near six Pages : And, whom does he oppose ? Not me, I am sure. Does he think I never heard of that common Saying, *petimus licitis* ? Or that I know not the Difference between *Use*, and *Abuse* ? He indeed *confounds* them ; but I do not. “ Our Souls (says he) may receive an infinite Hurt, and be render’d incapable of all true Vertue *merely by the Use* of innocent and lawful Things.” \* By the *Abuse*, if he pleases : But that is something *more* than *merely the Use*. And afterwards ; “ How can all these Evils which arise from the *Use* of these Things *indifferent*, and *lawful* in themselves, &c. †”

For the rest (I mean what is contain’d in these six Pages) I only make a few short Observations. When he says *Trade*, and *Labour* are *innocent*, he contradicts his own Doctrine in his *Christian Perfection* ; as I shall shew hereafter. In his Enumeration of innocent, and indifferent Things, he omits all *Diversions*, except *Conversation* ; whereas I think there are *other* innocent *Diversions* : He teaches us that the “ *strict Law* of Religion is to seek *only* Health, and not the Pleasure of various Tastes in our Food. ‡” Now I think it is *lawful*, and *innocent*, in *some measure*, with *Moderation*, *Sobriety*, and *Temperance*, to seek

E.

\* P. 24, 25.

† P. 26.

‡ P. 25.

the *Pleasure* of *Taste* (even of *various* *Tastes*) in our *Food*. And how, and where has He *prov'd* that it is *not*? P. 25. He has these Words. "What *Sensuality* of "Discourse shall we not *every Day* fall "into; unless it be a *fix'd Law* to us, to "speak of *no other Joy* in our *Food*, but "that which is express'd by our *Grace* before, and after *Meals*?" To say *This is good Meat*, or *That is good Drink*, and to appear in any degree *pleas'd* that it is so, is, it seems, *Sensuality of Discourse*, or at least has a strong *Tendency* towards such *Sensuality*: It ought to be a *fix'd Law* to us not to express any such *Pleasure*. What is This but making Religion *ridiculous* to Some, and a *Torment* to Others? This is indeed to *lay Snares*, to intangle *well-dispos'd* and *pious*, but *weak*, and *injudicious* People in endless *Doubts*, *Scruples*, and *Perplexities*, about *Things of nothing*; contrary to *Christian Liberty*, and the *free*, not *servile*, Spirit, and Genius of the Gospel. Our Author, in a Passage above quoted, says something, as disapproving of *Superstition*. What is *Superstition*, if *This* be not?

I might here observe upon This Article of *uncommanded Abstinence*, that Those who enjoy God's *Creatures* in some Degree, that is, with *Temperance*, and *Moderation*, may exercise more *Self-denial*, and *Mortification*,

tion, than Those who are *altogether abstemious*. The Former could, with *Temperance* and *Sobriety*, gratify themselves *more*; but *will not*. The Latter by *total Abstemiousness* may have no such *Appetites*, but the contrary; and so exercise *no* Self-denial at all. If it be said, that, however, they exercis'd a great deal of it, before they brought themselves to such a Habit; I answer, perhaps they did: But *who required these Things at their Hands?*

P. 28. "That which is to direct our Prayers, and govern us at Church, must with the *same Strictness* direct our *Conversation*, and govern our Dealings in common Life." Now I think the *strictest Rules* of Religion require not the *same Strictness* in our *Conversation*, &c. as in our *Prayers*, and *at Church*. Let the judicious Reader judge. "We must *dress* with the *same Spirit* that we *give Alms*, or go to *Prayers*." Not quite, I conceive. "That is, we must no more dress to be *seen*, and *admir'd* by others, than we must give *Alms*, or make *Prayers* for the same Reasons." We should certainly not give *Alms*, or make *Prayers*, to be *seen of Men*: Our Saviour forbids Both; but he says not the same of *Dress*, nor any thing at all about it: And sure, according to the Nature of Things, we may *dress* to be *seen*. Our Habit should be *clean, decent, comely*:

And to what Purpose is it so, if it be not *seen*? To the other Word *admired* I object nothing; tho' perhaps something material might be objected even to That; with relation to some certain *Persons*, and *Circumstances*.

P. 29. " Yet the Doctor complains of the  
 " *Treatise upon Christian Perfection*; be-  
 " cause Christians in *Sickness*, *Distress*, and  
 " *Dejection* of Spirit are there *solely* di-  
 " rected to seek for Comfort and Refresh-  
 " ment in God *alone*." I spoke nothing of  
*Sickness*; and did not think of it: I spoke  
 of *Grief*, and *Melancholy*; which I inti-  
 mated it was lawful to divert by inno-  
 cent Recreations. The Case of *Sickness* is  
 quite different. " And the Doctor might  
 " as well be angry at the Gospel for having  
 " made no mention of *worldly Amusements*  
 " proper for *sick*, and *distress'd Christians*,  
 " as at the *Treatise upon Christian Per-*  
 " *fection*, for not having done the same." I  
 answer, there is this Difference. The  
 Gospel is only *silent* about worldly Amuse-  
 ments; the *Treatise upon Christian Per-*  
*fection* *condemns* them.

*Ibid.* " If I should see a *sick Man smel-*  
 " *ling a Rose*, eating an *agreeable Fruit*,  
 " or *diverting* himself with a *Child*; I  
 " should not call him from such sinful In-  
 " dulgences." Now I *should*, if they were  
 really sinful Indulgencies. But what a  
 whimsical



whimsical Idea is a *sick Man's smelling a Rose*, &c. I neither spoke, nor thought of a *sick Man*; nor (in this Place) of *smelling a Rose* neither. "But if he wanted Comfort in his State; I would no more direct him to *any thing* but the great and solid Comforts that are to be found in the Love, and Goodness of God, than I would direct him to *another Saviour*, than *Jesus Christ*." No more would I, in *Sickness*; especially such Sickness as is near *Death*. To talk of *Amusements, Diversions, and Recreations*, in such a Case, would be both absurd, and wicked. But what is all This to *Me* again? Do I say one Word about it?

P. 30. "To tell Christians that in *some kinds of Trouble*" [This is to the *Purpose*; I do say that in *some kinds of Trouble* it is lawful to use *some Recreations and Diversions*:] "they might justly seek for Relief by reading a *Play*, or wanton *Bucolick*, instead of the *Gospel*——" How comes This in? I said nothing of *Plays*, or *wanton Bucolicks*, or *any Bucolicks* at all; nor were they the least in my Thoughts. The *Conversation of Friends* I take to be the best of all *Diversions*; especially for the Persons of whom I was speaking. Not that I know any Harm in a Man's diverting himself with reading *Terence's Comedies*, or *Sophocles's Tragedies*,  
or

or even *some* modern Plays ; or *Virgil's*, or *Theocritus's* *Bucolicks*, and that too, tho' there should be somewhat of Wantonness in them ; as there is but very little. He must be a very injudicious Man, as well as a wretched Christian, who in reading the Heathen Poets, and such like Authors, whether ancient, or modern, cannot separate the Gold from the Dross ; reap much Benefit from what is good in them, and be not at all infected, or defiled with what is evil. But why those Words *instead of the Gospel* ? Who was ever *prophane* enough, or *Fool* enough, to say that such Books may be read *instead of the Gospel* ? That, no doubt, should be read, and studied *chiefly*, or above all things : But does it therefore follow that we must read *nothing else* ? Or that, if we read the *Classicks*, we must *not* read the *Bible* ? “ To tell them (he says) “ that they might seek for Relief by “ reading such Things *instead of the Gospel*, would be the same Absurdity, as to “ have told People, in our Saviour's Time, “ that in *some Sorts* of Distress they might “ justly have recourse to *Simon Magus* instead of *Jesus Christ*.” Let him enjoy his Saying with all my Heart ; tho' I think it is a strange one : Who ever *told* them any such thing ?

*Ibid.* “ But now to look back a little.”  
 — I wonder he is not *ashamed to look back* ;

back; considering what he has written. " I have *shewn* that the Doctor's Discourse (where it is not disliked) must do great Hurt, and have dreadful Effects, &c. The one Sort it seals up in a false Security, sleeping in the Chambers of Death, without any Oil in their Vessels; the other it frightens, and discourages from their pious Intentions of trimming their Lamps, &c." This he has *shewn*; that is, in his *Way* of shewing, he has said it. I, on the contrary, in *my Way*, have shewn it, that is *prov'd* it, to be most wickedly false in every Particular.

He proposes, p. 31. to " lay down a short, but plain Account of the whole Nature and Ground of the Christian Religion." This he does for near 30 Pages: And such an Account it is, as is altogether singular; purely the Coinage of his own Imagination; founded upon no Reason, or Scripture; but much of it contrary to Both. As I have no more to do with it, than any body else; I shall only make a few cursory Observations upon it; and, for a Sample, transcribe a few Passages of it: Tho' even That will be Answer sufficient. He tells us that *Lucifer*, and his Angels, before their Fall, were in the Place where This visible World now stands, and could not possibly leave the Place of their Sin, and Fall; whereas I thought they had

had been in *Heaven*, and were cast out from thence; *The Angels who kept not their first Estate, but lost their own Habitation*, says St. Jude. That *Darkness was upon the Face of the Deep at the Creation*; because the fallen *Angels, losing the Divine Light within themselves, brought their whole Kingdom into Darkness, Grossness, Wrath, and Disorder*: [Does This Stuff deserve an Answer?] That when *Moses* says, in the *Beginning God created the Heaven, and the Earth*, he means after the Fall of the Rebel Angels; and that This *Creation*, or rather *Restoration*, was made out of the *Materials of THEIR ruin'd Angelical Kingdom*: That "the first Man came into this World in that *same glorious Body*, " in which, after the Resurrection, he shall " *be like the Angels in Heaven*." Upon This last, Mrs. *Bourignon* talks much at the same rate. But how came they by their Intelligence here? Does not This look like adding to the Scriptures, and being wise and knowing, *above that which is written*? For as to a Person's being *himself inspir'd*; I will never believe it, 'till he proves it. P. 40. He calls the *Holy Jesus* the *inspoken Word of Grace*. To put such fantastical Cant Names upon the Majesty of the Great God, the *Holy Jesus*, is, I think, *Prophaneness*: And he is Elsewhere as *familiar with all the three Persons*



sons of the adorable, and ever blessed Trinity. " Man (says He, P. 31.) was created a living, real, perfect Image of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This I have largely explain'd, and proved elsewhere." Referring us to his *Grounds, and Reasons of Christian Regeneration*. In which, he has neither explain'd, nor prov'd any thing; but without Explanation, or Proof, thrown together such a Heap of monstrous Enthusiastical Absurdities, and Impieties, unintelligible Jargon, and raving Dreams, as in my Life I never saw Before. I appeal to the World; let any Man in his *Wits* read, and judge. As to the present Point; that *Man was made in the Image of God is certain*; the Scripture says so: But that He was " created a PERFECT Image of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," how dares this Man affirm? Why, he has explain'd it, and prov'd it, in the Treatise he refers to. Let us see *how* \*. " Man was created by God after his own Image——a living Mirror of the Divine Nature; where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each brought forth their own Nature in a CREATURELY MANNER. As the Son, who is the Begotten of the Father, is the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, and

F

" the

\* *Grounds and Reasons, &c. [At the Beginning.]*

“ the Son, as an *amiable, moving Life of*  
 “ *Both*; so it was in this created Image  
 “ of the Holy Trinity. IN IT the Fa-  
 “ *ther's Nature* generated the Divine  
 “ *Word, or Son*; and the Holy Ghost pro-  
 “ ceeded from them Both, as an *amiable*  
 “ *moving Life of Both*. THIS was the  
 “ *Likeness, or Image* of God, in which  
 “ the first Man was created, a *true Off-*  
 “ *spring* of God, in whom the *Divine*  
 “ *Birth sprung up*, AS IN THE DEITY;  
 “ where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost  
 “ SAW THEMSELVES IN A CREATURELY  
 “ MANNER. In the Divine Nature the  
 “ Father cannot possibly be separated from  
 “ the Son, nor the Holy Ghost from Both,  
 “ or Either of them. But *such Separation*  
 “ *could* come to pass in the TRINITY  
 “ BECOME CREATURELY, or in the cre-  
 “ ated living Image of the Trinity. If  
 “ such Separation could not have hap-  
 “ pen'd, Man *could not* have fallen out of  
 “ *Paradise*: For so long as This Image  
 “ of the Holy Trinity continued *unbroken*,  
 “ so far it must be in *Paradise, Heaven*,  
 “ or the Kingdom of divine Joy. But that  
 “ this *Separation* could happen in this cre-  
 “ ated Image of the Trinity, *viz.* that  
 “ the *Birth of the Son*, and the *Arising*,  
 “ or *Proceeding* of the Holy Ghost could  
 “ be *separated, or lost*, is also certain;  
 “ because Man is actually fallen out of Pa-  
 “ radise,

“radise, into this poor, wretched, perishing-  
 “able World.” I have *transcribed* This :  
 and tho’ one would think that is *enough* ;  
 yet I ask, 1st, What *Explanation*, what  
*Proof* is here ? For we were promis’d Both,  
 when we were refer’d to this famous Work.  
 Why, here is *Explanation* by Words  
 which are themselves *inexplicable* ; and  
*Proof* by mere *Saying*, and *Affirming* :  
 For there is no more *Explanation*, or real  
*Proof* throughout the whole Pamphlet,  
 than in this Part of it which I have quoted.  
 2dly, Because God says, *simply*, and with-  
 out any *Explication*, or *Distinction*, that  
*Man was made in his Image* ; does it  
 therefore become this Writer to take such  
 an *astonishing*, and *unheard-of Liberty* with  
 the *three glorious Persons* in the *tremen-*  
*dous Godhead*, talking of *Them*, and their  
*distinct Relations* IN *Man* their Image, as  
*familiarly*, and *positively*, as if he were of  
 their Council, and knew the *deep*, even the  
 deepest *Things of God* ; without the least  
 Warrant from Scripture, or one single Hint  
 in those sacred Writings tending that Way ?  
 “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each  
 “ brought forth their own Nature in a  
 “ creaturely manner ? ” — The Holy Ghost  
 “ an amiable living Life of the Father,  
 “ and the Son ? In whom [Man] the Di-  
 “ vine Birth sprung up as in the Deity ;  
 “ where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost saw

“ *themselves in a creaturely manner?* ” I will not *re-transcribe* any more. All I can say is, I am perfectly amazed and confounded—As to the rest, I leave the Reader to his own Thoughts. For Men to talk without *any Ideas* annex’d to their Words, *understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm\**, upon any Subject whatsoever, is contrary to *Reason*; but to talk so of the three *divine Persons*, in the adorable Trinity, and in so positive, and peremptory a manner, is, I think, *irreligious*, as well as *irrational*. But we return to the *earnest, and serious Answer*.

P. 34. “ And when as many thousand  
 “ Years were gone through, as there had  
 “ been Days in the Creation, this *whole*  
 “ *Frame* of Things was by the last *puri-*  
 “ *fying Fire* to have been raised from its  
 “ paradisaical State, into which it was put  
 “ at the Creation, into that *first heavenly*  
 “ Brightness, and high Degree of Glory,  
 “ in which it stood before the Fall of *Luci-*  
 “ *fer.* ” These Words contain *four* Propo-  
 sitions, (which I will not be at the Trouble  
 of drawing out in Form, let the Reader do  
 it himself, if he thinks it worth his while) for  
 which there is not the *least Foundation*, ei-  
 ther in *Reason*, or *Scripture*: yet asserted  
 as dogmatically, as if they were either  
*self-*

\* 1 Tim. i. 7.



*self-evident*, or as *demonstrable* as any Proposition in *Euclid*.

P. 38. "Many learned Men, either not  
 " *seeing*, or not *loving*, or being *afraid to*  
 " *own it*, [meaning the Doctrine of *Rege-*  
 " *neration*, as *He* states it] have been  
 " forced not only to *mistake*, but *wholly*  
 " *to sink* the most solid, substantial, edify-  
 " ing, and glorious Article of the Christian  
 " Faith." How *modest*, and how *chari-*  
*table* is This! One learned Man (a most  
 learned one indeed) whom he particularly  
 reflects upon, is the excellent Author of  
*Regeneration stated, and explained, accord-*  
*ing to Scripture, and Antiquity*, who is \*,  
 and ever will be, the Honour of our Coun-  
 try. He censures such Persons for *running*  
*from Book to Book, from Language to*  
*Language, consulting all Criticks, to shew,*  
*&c. i. e. for being learned, and making*  
*Use* of their Learning; I can make nothing  
 else of it. "If This (says he, P. 39, 40.)  
 " be the Use of Learning among ourselves,  
 " we need not look at *Rome*—to see what  
 " miserable Work Learning can make with  
 " the Holy Scriptures." If *Learning* can  
 make miserable Work with the Holy Scrip-  
 tures;

\* The great Dr. *Waterland*, my dear, and ever  
 honoured Friend, was living, when this was written;  
 at least I had not heard of his Death: which I now la-  
 ment as an inexpressible Loss to our Church, and Na-  
 tion, and the whole Christian World.

tures; what Work can *Ignorance*, and *Ill-literature* make with them? The Former indeed *may* do so *by Accident*, through Prejudice, or ill Design; but the Latter *must* do so by its own *natural Tendency*. It is nothing strange, however, that *Enthusiasm* should be no Friend to *Learning*: It was ever so, and ever will be.

P. 46, 47. "He [*vain Man*, i. e. such " a one as this Gentleman does not like] " makes learned Appeals to *Reason*, and " *Common Sense*, to judge between Him, " and the Gospel." Why really, *Reason*, and *Common Sense* are good Things; and We shall always stand by them; how little soever *They*, as well as *Learning*, may be liked by Others: But we do not make Appeals to Them to judge *between Us*, and the Gospel. We say the Gospel is on *our Side*; and we only make use of *Reason*, and *Common Sense*, join'd with *Learning*, to judge of its *true Meaning*. " Which is just as " wise, as to ask the learned *Greek*, and " the worldly *Jew*, whether the *Cross* of " Christ be not *Foolishness*, and a just Rock " of Offence." Are Reason, and Common Sense then as averse to the Gospel, as the learned *Greek*, and the worldly *Jew* were to the *Cross* of Christ? What can be a more scurvy Reflection upon the Gospel, than This? " Or to appeal to *Flesh*, and " *Blood* about the narrow Way to that " *Kingdom*

" *Kingdom of Heaven*, into which itself  
 " cannot possibly have any Entrance." I  
 ask again, are *Reason*, and *Common Sense*,  
 (which are the Gift of God, no less than  
 Revelation itself, are antecedent to it, and  
 must judge concerning the Truth of it) as  
 averse to the Gospel, as *Flesh* and *Blood*  
 are to the *narrow Way*, &c. Sure This  
 likewise is not for the Honour of the Gos-  
 pel.

P. 49. " OUR SALVATION wholly con-  
 " sists in the INCARNATION of the Son of  
 " God in the Soul, or Life, of Man. THAT  
 " must be DONE, and BORN in Us, which  
 " was DONE, and BORN in the *Virgin Ma-*  
 " *ry*." Were such Words ever heard of a-  
 mong Christians Before? But it is not  
 strange that the *Incarnation* should be  
 treated by him with no more Reverence  
 than the *Trinity*. Thus again, P. 50. —  
 " A *second Adam*, who was born of the  
 " *Virgin Mary* in the *same Degree* of Per-  
 " fection, in which the first Man was cre-  
 " ated." That is, according to Him, P. 35,  
 37. in a *pearly, paradisaical, glorious Body*.  
 I never heard Before that our Saviour's  
 Body was *glorify'd*, 'till after his *Resurrec-*  
*tion*: That it was *born* so is perfectly  
 New. — Again, P. 51. " Therefore if  
 " we are to have the NATURE of CHRIST  
 " *regenerated* in Us [as in the Words just  
 " before he says we must have] — then  
 " there

“ there is an *absolute Necessity* that *THAT*  
 “ which was *done*, and *born* in the Virgin  
 “ *Mary* be also by the *same Power* of the  
 “ Holy Ghost *done*, and *born* in *Us*, by a  
 “ *Seed* of Life, derived unto us by Christ  
 “ our Regenerator.” With more to the  
 same Purpose, both Before, and After.  
 Whether you consider the *Divinity*, or the  
*Sense* of This; could *George Fox* himself  
 have out-done it?

P. 53. “ For the further, and full View  
 “ of this important Matter, I refer the  
 “ Reader to another *little Book*; which, if  
 “ I could afford it, should be sent *gratis*  
 “ into all Parts of the Kingdom.” The  
 Gentleman, it should seem, has a compe-  
 tently good Opinion of his Work. But I  
 heartily wish the Inhabitants of all Parts  
 of the Kingdom (I mean the *Common Peo-  
 ple* especially) would read the *Whole Duty  
 of Man*, and the *Christian Monitor*, rather  
 than the *little Book* upon the *Grounds and  
 Reasons of Christian Regeneration*, &c.  
 The *two first* tend to make them *good*, and  
*sober Christians*; as the last does to make  
 them *mad*. Besides the Specimen which I  
 have already given of this extraordinary  
 Piece; how greatly must every Parish in  
 the Kingdom be edify'd, and inlighten'd  
 by being told that the Soul of fallen Man  
 “ was something that was depriv'd of *That*  
 “ *Birth* which was the *Brightness* of its  
 “ *Glory*,



“ *Glory*, and which should be *That* to it,  
 “ which the *Son of God* is to the *Father* ;  
 “ it wanted *that Spirit* which was its *ami-*  
 “ *able Life* ; and which was to be *That* to  
 “ it, which the *Holy Ghost* is to the *Fa-*  
 “ *ther*, and the *Son* : \* That the Soul was  
 “ still a *Life*—Now seeing every *Life*,  
 “ whether spiritual, or corporeal, consists  
 “ in *Fire*, or rather *is Fire* : [Whereas I  
 think a *Spirit* can’t be *Fire*, because *Fire*  
 is *Body*, or *Matter* .] “ That it was not  
 “ the *mere eating of a Fruit* that brought  
 “ *Adam’s* Misery upon him, but it was  
 “ the eating of a *Fruit*, as his *chosen Means*  
 “ of entering into this *World* : God him-  
 “ self *was not angry at all* at a *small Act*  
 “ *of eating a Fruit*, and so in Anger turn’d  
 “ Man out of *Paradise*, &c.” † Which I  
 take to be contrary to Scripture : That  
 “ the Soul, by the losing of the Birth of  
 “ the Son of God in it, is become *an aking*  
 “ *dark Root of Fire* ;” and elsewhere, “ a  
 “ *spiritual, dark, raging, aking, Fire-*  
 “ *breath*, that can draw no *Light of Love*  
 “ into it :” ‡ With very many other Pas-  
 sages of equal *Weight, Truth, and Sense*.

From P. 22. to P. 30. there is something  
 which is called PROOF : *Proof* of This ex-  
 traordinary Proposition, “ That the *Like-*  
 “ *ness*, and *Image* of God, in which Man  
 “ was created, signify’d thus much, that

G

“ Father,

\* P. 10, 11.

† P. 22.

‡ P. 34, and P. 11.

“ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each  
 “ brought forth their *own Nature* in him;  
 “ and in *Him* saw *themselves* in a *Creature-*  
 “ *ly Manner.*” The Word *Proof* engaged  
 my Attention very much; and I read the  
 Whole with great Care. But notwithstanding the formal Show of *First, Secondly, Thirdly, and Fourthly*; I can find nothing of *Proof*; no Relation between the Premises, and the Conclusion. Let Him judge who thinks fit to peruse it; I am not affected by it: And I dare say, This, with the rest of the Pamphlet, is in no Danger of being *Answer'd*. The Treatise is offer'd to the Consideration of *Christians*, and *Deists*: I doubt it makes the *Deists merry*; as it makes all judicious *Christians sad*. But to return again to the *earnest, and serious Answer*.

P. 55. “ So that to be called to the  
 “ Height of all Vertue attainable in this  
 “ Life, however *excessive* it may seem to  
 “ the *Reasonings* of Flesh, and Blood”—  
 It does not seem excessive to *my Reasonings*:  
 Nor have I said any thing against it. P. 56.  
 “ No Vertue therefore has any blameable  
 “ Extreme in it, 'till it contradicts this ge-  
 “ neral End of Religion, 'till it hinders the  
 “ Restoration of the divine Image in us, or  
 “ makes us less fit to appear amongst the  
 “ Inhabitants of Heaven.” Instead of Ex-  
 tremes in it, say Extreme on one Side of it;  
 and

and I think so too: But I think withal, that the Excess of any Vertue (*all Excess* being *vicious*) *does* hinder, &c. “*Abstinence, Temperance, Mortification* of the Senses and “*Passions* can have no *Excess*, ’till they hinder the *Purification* of the Soul, and “make the Body less useful, and subservient to it.” True; but *some* Excesses of Abstinence may *not promote*, perhaps may *hinder*, the Purification of the Soul; and make the Body less useful, and subservient: It may fill the Soul with *Pride*, and the *Body* with *Diseases*. “*Charity* “can have no *Excess*, ’till it contradicts “That Love which we are to have in “Heaven.” Charity includes the Love of God, and of our Neighbour. And it is certain we cannot love God *excessively*, or too much; nor our *Neighbours* neither, with regard to the *inward Temper* and Disposition of our Souls: We cannot *wish* their Happiness too much, *pray* for them too earnestly, and the like; But with regard to *outward Actions* we may be drawn into many Errors, and *unjustifiable Practises*, for want of *truly distinguishing* the *Circumstances* of *Persons*, and *Things*, by a *mistaken Notion* of *Charity*, and Love to our *Neighbours*; nay, and by a *mistaken Notion* of the *Love of God* too. “Till it is “more than that which would lay down “its Life even for an Enemy.” If our

Charity be not *excessive*, 'till it *exceed* That of laying down our Lives for an Enemy ; Charity *requires* us to lay down our Lives for an Enemy, or at least it is the *Perfection* of Charity to do so. But is This *true* ? absolutely, *indiscriminately* true ? For an Enemy ? For *any* Enemy whatsoever ; be *his*, and *our* Circumstances what they will ? Nay, why for any Enemy at all ? What Reason, what Scripture is there for This ? Why must a Man sacrifice his Life to save the Life of his Enemy ? Our Saviour indeed commands us to *love*, and *do good* to our Enemies : But where does either He, or any one of his Apostles command, or so much as recommend, our *dying* for them ? He himself, it is true, who was God as well as Man, in the most *publick Capacity* laid down his Life for his Enemies : But those Enemies were the whole World ; and it was to redeem them from Sin, and eternal Misery. But does it therefore follow that it is *Perfection*, nay so much as *Duty*, or even a *justifiable Action*, for a *private Person* to die for *another* private Person, who is his Enemy ? “ ‘Till it *exceeds* That “ which the *first Christians* practised, when “ they had *all Things common*.” Here again, if Charity be not Now *excessive*, 'till it *exceeds* having *all Things common*, as among the FIRST Christians ; then Charity *requires* us to have all Things common ; at least



least 'tis the *Perfection* of Charity to have them so. This has been suggested by some of the *Methodists*: And, if due Care be not taken, perhaps we may shortly hear more of it: Our Author, you see, comes into it; and the Consequence of it must be the Dissolution of *Government*, and *human Society*. The Difference between our Case *now*, when whole Nations and Kingdoms are Christian, and That of Christians in the *Days of the Apostles*, is so evident; that I will not affront the Reader's Judgment by saying any more of it. " 'Till it exceeds  
 " That of St. *John*, who requires him that  
 " has *two Coats* to give to him that has  
 " *none*." Does this Gentleman then take those Words in the *strict Letter*? If he does; how can he keep *two Coats*, or two Garments of *any Sort*, when there are so many who have *none*? " 'Till it is loving  
 " our poor Brethren *more* than Christ has  
 " lov'd us." It seems then we are to love them *as much* as Christ lov'd us. This I take to be impossible: *His* Love to us was beyond the Powers of *mere Man*; transcendent, infinite, not to be equal'd by us.  
 " 'Till it goes beyond the Command of  
 " loving our Neighbour as we love Our-  
 " selves." That we are to *love our Neighbour as ourselves*, is certain from Scripture: But how? In *Kind*, not in *Degree*; which latter I take again to be impossible. " 'Till  
 " it

“ it forgets that our own Life is to be preserved.” Why so? Ought we not to preserve our Lives in the *ordinary* Course of Things? Is it not our Duty? In some Cases indeed we ought to *sacrifice* our Lives. But why is this Proposition laid down in such universal Terms? Certainly the general Rule is to *preserve* our Lives; tho’ This (like other general Rules) admits of Exceptions.

Upon the two Articles of *Temperance*, and *Charity*, he represents my Doctrine as destructive of both those Vertues; and Me as guilty of the most horrid Impiety in *defaming our Saviour’s most holy Life*, and *misapplying Scripture*. A more hideous Outcry could not well have been made; if I had denied the Christian Faith, or exploded all Christian Morality. And what is the Matter? Why, as to *Temperance*, I said that our Blessed Saviour was present at *Feasts*; and at one of them wrought a Miracle to *make Wine*, &c. Serm. P. 17. As to *Charity*; I said that we are to make Provision for our *Families*, our *Wives*, and *Children*; and not beggar, and ruin *them*, by giving *too much* to the *Poor*. Serm. P. 60.

Upon the First, he has these Words.  
 “ O Holy *Jesus*, that thy Divine Life  
 “ should by a Preacher of thy Gospel be  
 “ made a Plea for Liberties of Indulgence!”

What

What occasion was there for This seemingly devout, but really profane Exclamation, and taking the Holy *Jesus's* Name in vain? WHAT Liberties of Indulgence do I plead for from This Passage of Scripture? Drinking more than is *absolutely necessary* for the Support of Nature, and indulging *something* to Pleasure, and Chearfulness. And how does he *prove* This to be in any Degree sinful, or even indecent, or improper? According to his Custom, he does not so much as attempt to prove any thing; but begs the Question, and goes on declaiming upon Supposition of That which ought not to be suppos'd. He proceeds thus. "If This *Lawfulness* is well proved, "the Doctor may go on, and prove these "Indulgences to be *good*, and *pious*; because what our Saviour work'd a Miracle "to *promote* must needs be esteem'd to be "so." This *I deny*: And here again he does not so much as attempt to *prove* it. Our Lord might work a Miracle in an *indifferent* Matter, to give Evidence of his divine Power, and *manifest forth his Glory*. "And so the *adding another Bottle*, when "Friends are rejoicing, may be made to be "a Christian Duty." No such Matter: Not a Christian *Duty*; but yet *lawful*, and *innocent*. But the Gentleman seems to think that *Distinguishing*, even in the *plainest* Cases, is a *Circumstance* of no Consequence,

sequenc, in *Argumentation*, and *Controversy*. By the way, that low, paultry Expression, *adding another Bottle*, might as well have been spar'd by so *holy a Writer* upon so *serious*, and *sacred* a Subject.

P. 58. " But the Doctor *should have remember'd*, that the Wine here spoken of," &c. And afterwards, " He *should have remember'd*, that it was Water only, " &c." Doubtless! I should have *remember'd* what neither I, nor any one else, ever heard of Before; that is to say, *his* ridiculous, senseless *Nostrum's*, (as profane, and impious too, as senseless, and ridiculous) the Whimsies of his own Brain, diluting the glorious Miracle at *Cana in Galilee* into Nothing, or Nobody knows what; all imposed upon the *learned World*, purely because he is *pleas'd* to say it, with the most peremptory, and unexampled Confidence, without the least Show, or Shadow of any *Proof* so much as pretended to. Whether what I affirm be true, or not, let the Reader judge from the Man's own Words. " But " the Doctor SHOULD HAVE REMEMBER'D, " that the *Wine* here spoken of was not " *common* Wine, and therefore has not the " *least Relation* to our *common Drinking*; " that it was not *Wine* from the *Juice* of " the Grape, [That's sagacious and philosophical; but however, I believe it was just the same *Sort* of Wine, *as if it had been*



*been* from the Juice of the Grape; because it  
 is a Part of my Faith, that our Saviour had  
 the Power of *Creating* :] “ That it had no-  
 “ thing in it but what came from a heavenly  
 “ Hand :” [ Questionless ; but what then ? ]  
 “ That it must have in it the *Purity*, and  
 “ *Vertue* of Him that made it.” [ This,  
 to my Apprehension, is an odd Mixture of  
*Nonsense*, and *Blasphemy* : ] “ That it  
 “ had as good *Qualities* in it, and was fit-  
 “ ted to have the same *Effects* upon Some  
 “ that drank it, as the *Clay* which he  
 “ moisten’d with his *Spittle* had upon the  
 “ Eyes of the Blind. [ Exactly the same  
 Case ! How stupid, and forgetful was I,  
 not to REMEMBER This ! ] “ He SHOULD  
 “ HAVE REMEMBER’D that it was *Water*  
 “ only *so alter’d*, and endued with *such*  
 “ *Qualities* as He was pleas’d to *put into*  
 “ *it* ; and therefore we may be sure it was  
 “ *Water* as *highly bless’d* for their Use as  
 “ they were *capable of* : [ The Reader must  
 pardon me, if I make no more Reflections,  
 till I come to the Close of this curious Spec-  
 ulation : *Transcribing* is *Toil* enough : ]  
 “ We may *be sure* it was fitter to allay the  
 “ *Heat*, and *Disorder* of their Drinking,  
 “ than if it had been *Water unaltered* by  
 “ our Saviour. [ So that the *Water*, when  
 it was made *Wine*, was *cooler* than when it  
 was *Water*. And This we may be *sure of*.  
 But I beg my Reader’s Pardon : Here in-  
 H                      deed

deed I SHOULD HAVE REMEMBER'D that I promis'd what I am asham'd to repeat.]  
 " To make them cooler (continues he) by  
 " giving them Water made fitter for that  
 " Purpose ; and to *raise their Faith* by its  
 " MIRACULOUSLY SEEMING to be turn'd  
 " into the best of Wine." Now I thought  
 it had been *miraculously* REAL Wine ; more  
 than *miraculously seeming* to be such. The  
 Ruler of the Feast thought so ; and we  
 may suppose Him to have been a good  
 Judge. " But (says my Adversary) \* ac-  
 " cording to the Doctor's HORRID AC-  
 " COUNT of this Miracle it must be said  
 " that He thereby shewed his Approbation  
 " of *continuing* such Pleasures of Drinking ;  
 " and has left us a *Proof* that We may do  
 " the same." *Continuing ?* How long con-  
 tinuing ? No longer than they might do  
 it with Temperance, and Innocency : I  
 give no more *horrid* an Account of it than  
 this. But as Objects of Sight are discol-  
 our'd by the indispos'd Humours of the  
 Eye ; so it is with respect to the Fancy,  
 or Imagination. This Gentleman can con-  
 ceive nothing in Conversation agreeable to  
 Religion, but what is *austere*, *gloomy*, and  
*dismal* ; and therefore figures to himself the  
 Image of *our Saviour*, eating, and drink-  
 ing, and assisting at a *Feast*, as *horrid*,  
*shocking*, and so forth, P. 59, 63. Whereas  
 I,

\* P. 59.

I, without offering the least *Indignity*, or *Irreverence* [they are *his* Words] to our Blessed Lord, can imagine him *adorably amiable* upon such an Occasion. Tradition says He *never laugh'd*: And indeed I believe so; to *laugh* seeming inconsistent with the *awful Wisdom*, and the *serious*, however *meek*, and *gentle*, *Majesty* of so Divine a Person. Yet at This Marriage-Feast I can conceive him with *something like a sweet and venerable Smile* in his Countenance; not disliking the *innocent Pleasantry* of the *other* Guests; tho' having Nothing of it *Himself*. But says our Author \* (what Occasion I gave for such a monstrous abusive Clamour, let the Reader determine) "I must farther VINDICATE the *Life*, and *Example* of our Blessed Lord from the *Indignity*, and *Irreverence* done to it by the Doctor." And so afterwards †; "Thus much may serve to VINDICATE our Saviour's *holy Life and Example* from the *shocking Misapplication* the Doctor has made of it." Here he tells us that when our Saviour said He *came eating, and drinking* (which Words of his I cited) "it was in Opposition to, and Distinction from, *John the Baptist*, who came eating *only one Sort of Food* ‡." What *Proof* here again? I say on the contrary, and I appeal to the World whether

H 2

the

\* P. 59.

† P. 62, 63.

‡ P. 59.

the Truth of it be not plain from Scripture, that the Difference was This: *John* lived an *Ascetick* Life, was *austere*, and *rigidly abstemious*; our Saviour *not*. "For the *Mortification* of the Baptist (continues "He) They [the *Jews*] condemn'd as "coming from the Devil; and the Condes- "cension of the Holy *Jesus* in coming to "their Tables they accused as *Gluttony*, "and *Wine-bibbing*." Coming to their Ta- bles? Was That all? Did He not eat, and drink at Those Tables, as well as come to them? Why eateth your Master with *Publicans*, and *Sinners*? say the *Pharisees*. Could the *Jews* accuse him of *Gluttony*, and *Wine-bibbing*, for eating and drinking nothing, when He sat down at Entertainments? "Now the Doctor (says "he) is PLAINLY doing what our Lord ac- "cused the *Jews* of: He with Them con- "demns the *Mortification of the Baptist* as "coming from the Devil." If the Man be really in his right Mind (and indeed the best Excuse we can make for him is to suppose that he is *not*) my Answer to him is, that (whatever is to be said of other Matters) such *Slander*, and *false Accusation* certainly come from the Devil. Do I say that the *Baptist's Mortification* came from the De- vil? Was I guilty of so horrid a Wicked- ness? Which if I had been, I should have deserv'd to have been immediately seiz'd by



by the Devil, and by him carry'd to Hell? Do I say one Word about *John* the Baptist; or so much as once mention his Name? Does *my Doctrine* in any Part of my Discourse, which this Writer is cavilling at, by any sort of the *most remote Implication*, condemn *John's* Mortification as coming from the Devil? What shall we say to these Things? Sure *extraordinary REAL Saintship* is not consistent with such *Diabolical Calumny*. "But he differs from the *Jews* in "this, that he does not condemn, but *ap-* " *proves of* our Lord, as a *Friend to Feasts,* "and *Merry-meetings.\**" I do not, it seems, condemn our Saviour, I hope not: How could the Man so much as think that *I should, or could?* Yet he positively says, I condemn *John* the Baptist as having his Mortification from the Devil: And sufficiently intimates that, with the *Jews*, I would have condemn'd *Christ* too, had not his Actions, in this particular, been agreeable to my own Inclinations. I "approve "of him as a *Friend to Feasts, and Merry-* " *meetings.*" I answer; I not only *ap-* *prove of,* but with the *humblest Adoration,* and *Gratitude,* praise and glorify EVERY THING our Lord did. But I did not say He was a *Friend* (I have no such Words) to Feasts, and *Merry-meetings*: Which last Expression by the way, I should think it ir-

reve-

*reverent*, if not *profane*, to apply to our Saviour: Tho' this Writer does not. All I say amounts to no more than This; that He was *no Enemy to Feasts*, and did not *disapprove* of them, as *unlawful*.

Our Author takes Notice † of our Lord's conversing with Sinners; as with the Publicans; and the Woman of *Samaria*: And asks "whether we may thence conclude " that the Lives of such Sinners were not " blameable in his Sight?" And the Use He makes of This is to *argue* (in *his* Way) that tho' our Lord was *found* at Feasts, yet he did not *favour* such Indulgences. I answer; There is much Difference between conversing with *Sinners*, and conversing with them *as* Sinners; between *keeping Company* with their *Persons*, and *partaking* with them in their *Sins*. Our Saviour was not only *found* at Feasts, but *partook* of those Feasts; which He would not have done, had they been in themselves *sinful*. Nay, he was not only present *at* them, and Partaker *of* them; but was *assisting* in one of them, by miraculously turning Water into Wine. This *Distinction*, one would think, is no mighty *Difficulty*; and yet it is such a one, as This Man's *undistinguishing* Head *could not*, or *would not*, get over.

In this Paragraph he mentions " the " *proud Sanctity* of the *learned Pharisees*".

For

† Ibid.

For my Part, I abhor the *proud Sanctity* of the *ancient learned* Pharisees; and the *no less proud Sanctity* of the *modern unlearned* Pharisees, or Pharisaical Men: Such as are not only *unlearned* themselves; but *envious Enemies* of Those who are *learned*, but not *proud*, or *Pharisaical*.

In the same Page we have another *Exclamation* by Way of Apostrophe to our Blessed Saviour. "O Holy Jesus, thou didst nothing of thy self; thou soughtest only the Glory of thy Father, &c." This is to introduce several \* Assertions; some of which he had laid down before, and I have taken Notice of already; others, which I have nothing to do with, some of them false, some not to the Purpose: 'Till we come to these Words. † "Lastly, if our Saviour came *eating*, and *drinking*, and was present, as is pretended, at cheerful Entertainments, to *shew* his *Ap- probation* of such Indulgence, &c." I did not say he was present at them *to shew* his Approbation of them; as if he came with *that Design*: But this *shews* that he did not *disapprove* of them; which is sufficient for my Purpose. "How came John the Baptist, that severe Master of Mortification, to be a fit Preparer of the Way to the Kingdom of Heaven? Surely his Voice must cry *wrong* if such Mortifica-  
tion

"tion was not right." Whoever said *such Mortification was not right?* I am sure, I said nothing like it. Our Saviour himself was a great Example of Mortification; tho' he came eating, and drinking, was sometimes at Feasts, and did not condemn them as *sinful*. "And if our Saviour *disapprov'd* of the Severity of his Life, and "Manners; how came he to point him out "to the Jews as a *burning, and shining* "Light?" Who, again, ever said that our Saviour *disapprov'd* of John the Baptist's Severity of Life? And with whom is this Writer disputing?

So much for my *horrid, and shocking* Assertions with relation to *Temperance*: amounting, in short, to This; That our Saviour was sometimes at Feasts; at one wrought a Miracle to turn Water into Wine; therefore Feasting is not absolutely unlawful. Now for my no less damnable Doctrine about *Charity*. Our Author cites my Words, Sermon. p. 60. *What, says the Half-Thinker, is not Charity to the Poor a most excellent Thing? And can I be too Charitable? Can I therefore bestow too much upon the Poor?* I answer; *Would you consider the other side; you would perceive, that tho' you cannot be too Charitable, yet you may bestow too much upon the Poor, to the Ruin of your Wife, and Children: Which is not Charity; but Madness,*  
and



and a great and most grievous Sin. Did you never hear that Charity begins at home? [Here he mangles my Words, by leaving out a very material Part of the Sentence:] Did you never read That of St. Paul; if any provide not for his own, and especially those of his own House, he hath deny'd the Faith, and is worse than an Infidel? Upon this Passage he thus animadverts. P. 63, 64, 65. "The Doctor's Proverb I shall leave to himself. But the Text of St. Paul, which he has as grossly mistaken, and misapply'd, as he did our Saviour's Miracle. [just as much the one, as the other] I MUST TAKE OUT OF HIS HANDS." What a Rescue is here like to be! Let the Reader observe carefully. But first, suppose the Text alledg'd did not fully answer my Purpose; yet is not the Thing true, that Parents are to provide for their Children? Is it not plain from Reason, and the Law of Nature, tho' Scripture were silent concerning it? As, however, it is not: Besides this Text, see 2 Cor. xii. 14. upon which thus Bishop Taylor in his *Holy Living*; in which our Author says every thing in his Books that offends me is again and again to be found\*. That excellent Prelate, upon the Duty of Parents to their Children, writes thus. "Parents must provide for their own, according to their Condition, Education, and

I

"Employ-

\* P. 110.

"Employment;" [A Bishop of *Winchester's*  
 Children therefore, according to Bishop *Taylor*,  
 should have more than 20 *l.* a Year  
 among them, and not be bred *Carpenters*,  
*&c.*] "called by *St. Paul* a *laying up for*  
 " *their Children*, that is, an enabling them  
 " by *competent Portions*, [This is almost,  
 if not quite, as wicked, as my *sufficient*  
*Provision*, which has been so much ex-  
 ploded:] " or good *Trades, Arts, or*  
 " *Learning*, to defend themselves against  
 " the *Chances of the World*, that they may  
 " not be exposed to *Temptation*, to *Beg-*  
 " *gary*, or *unworthy Arts*. And altho'  
 " This must be done without *Covetousness*,  
 " without *Impatience*, and *greedy Desires*  
 " of making them rich; yet it must be  
 " done with *much Care*, and *great Affec-*  
 " *tion*, with all *reasonable Provision*, and  
 " according to our *Power* : And if we can  
 " without *Sin improve our Estates* for  
 " them; that also is Part of the *Duty* we  
 " owe to God for them \*." All I assert  
 amounts to no more than This; and is it  
 not true? No; it is *not*, according to  
 this Writer; he sets himself against it with  
 all his *Might*, and so do some other Pamph-  
 leteers against my Discourse. I intreat the  
 Reader to peruse *True Spirit of the Metho-*  
*dists*, &c. P. 15, 61, 62, 63. What a  
 blessed Condition would the World be in,  
 if

\* *Holy Living*, P. 163.

if the Doctrines of these false *Saints* should be follow'd ! *All Things in common*—and no *Provision made by Parents for their Children*. But after all, 2dly, How is this Text of *St. Paul* so grossly mistaken, and misapply'd by me ? “ *St. Paul's Words* “ (he says) are quoted to prove that it is “ *Madness, a great and grievous Sin*, for “ any one through *Charity* to the Poor to “ *render himself unable* to provide for his “ *Wife, and Children*.” It seems then, according to *Him*, it is *not* a Sin to do so. “ Now the Apostle in this Place speaks no “ more about *this Sin*, than he speaks a- “ gainst the Sin of *Watching*, and *Prayer*.” So that, according to *Him* again, *not providing for one's Wife, and Children* by giving to the Poor, is no more a Sin, than *Watching*, and *Prayer*. “ Nay, what is more, “ there is not in all his Writings, or in the “ whole New Testament, the least *Suppo-* “ *sition*, or *Hint*, that such a Sin ever “ was, or would be committed by any cha- “ *ritable Man*.” Truly charitable, if he pleases, that is, charitable with Wisdom, Discretion, and Justice : But there may be such a Thing as *false*, and *mistaken Charity* ; and of That I was speaking. “ The “ Apostle was singly speaking of such Wo- “ men as were to be taken into the Order “ of *Widows*, — He says *if any* “ *provide not*, — *i. e.* if any *Sons*, or “ *Nephews*,

“ *Nephews*, having *Mothers*, or *Aunts*—  
 “ take not Care to assist them, such have  
 “ renounc’d” — I answer, first, What  
 if this general Maxim, *If any Man provide*  
*not*,— were laid down by the Apostle,  
 upon a *particular* Occasion? Is it ever the  
 less *general*, or the less *true* for That?  
 2dly, If People ought to *provide* for their  
*Aunts*; I think they ought much more to  
 provide for their *Wives*, and *Children*; be-  
 cause I take *Them* to be nearer *Relations*.  
 “ This alone (continues he \*) is the plain  
 “ Doctrine of the Apostle; which the Doc-  
 “ tor has *grossly perverted* to the condemn-  
 “ ing of that which He *never thought of*,  
 “ either there, or in any Part of Scrip-  
 “ ture.” St. Paul, belike, *never thought*  
 of such a *monstrous Absurdity*, such *abomi-*  
*nable Wickedness*, as That of a Man’s *pro-*  
*viding for his Wife, and Children*. Now  
 I have before referred to 2 Cor. xii. 14.  
 And even here I should rather imagine that  
 when the Apostle spoke these general  
 Words, concerning *one’s own*, and *Those of*  
*one’s own House*, he had some *Thoughts* at  
 least of *Wives*, and *Children*; tho’ the Case  
 of *Mothers*, *Aunts*, or *Grandmothers*, was  
 his more direct, and immediate Subject.  
 This Text, one would imagine, has no great  
 Difficulty in it: Yet, since such dreadful  
 Objections have been raised against the Use I  
 made

\* P. 64, 65.



made of it, I have consulted the learned *Commentators* (for tho' This Gentleman is above that *low Dispensation*, I am not) and find that they do not understand it of *Mothers*, and *Aunts* only; but of *near Relations*, or *Kindred* at large. *Suis*, i. e. *quomodocunque propinquis, vel cognatione, vel affinitate*. So *Estius*, and *Vorstius*. *Junctis sanguine, qui sunt id est*. So *Grotius*. *Maxime domesticis*, i. e. *sanguine proximis*. So *Estius* again. Our Author proceeds.

" On the contrary, the Scripture a-  
 " bounds with Passages that might per-  
 " suade us, that no Family could ever  
 " be ruin'd by the *Alms* and *Charity* of  
 " its Father." The Texts he cites might  
 have been spared: They speak of *true*  
*Charity*, which I recommend; not of *false* and  
*mistaken* *Charity*, which He recommends.  
 " Had any one (says he) in the Apostle's  
 " Time reduced his Wife and Children to  
 " Want by his *great Charity* to the Poor,  
 " the Apostle would have been so far from  
 " rebuking him as a *half-thinking Fool*,  
 " that he would have told him that he  
 " had consecrated himself, &c." This He  
*affirms*, and This I *deny*: And as he pro-  
 duces no other Proof, so I give no other  
 Answer.

" I will now suppose (adds He \*) that  
 " the Apostle had condemn'd a *Charity* in a  
 " *Father*,

\* P. 65, 66.

“ *Father*, that was to the Detriment of  
 “ his *Wife*, and *Children* ; I will put the  
 “ following Case in as high Terms as the  
 “ Doctor can well desire.” Suppose that  
 the Apostle had *condemn’d* a Charity that  
 was to the *Detriment* — Then he sup-  
 poses what I say to be true, I think : And  
 if so ; how does he put the following Case  
 in as high Terms as I can desire ; when  
 that Case is put to shew that what I say is  
*not* true ? I can make no Sense of This.  
 But pray hear the Case. It takes up al-  
 most two Pages\* ; and is, in short, This.  
 “ Suppose some good Bishop, possess’d of as  
 “ rich a Bishoprick as that of *Winchester*,  
 “ should live so *frugally in Family Ex-*  
 “ *pence*, as to give great Sums to the Poor,  
 “ and leave his Children 20 *l.* a Year a-  
 “ mong them, to be bred *Carpenters*, and  
 “ *Tent-makers*, as in the Days of our Sa-  
 “ viour, and his Apostles, &c.” I answer  
 very clearly, and plainly ; that the said  
 Bishop would be a *Madman* ; as mad as  
 This Writer persuades every body else  
 to be. *He* supposes that by this Con-  
 duct the Bishop would make his Children  
 extraordinary good Christians ; and *I* sup-  
 pose that he would make them the direct  
 contrary : *He* supposes that they would *re-*  
*joice in his Memory* ; and *I* suppose they  
 would *abhor his Memory* : *He* supposes  
 that

\* P. 66, 67.

that such an Example would *bid fair to put an End to Infidelity*; and I suppose that it would *increase Infidelity*, by making Christianity a Jest to Infidels: And so we have *suppos'd* on both Sides, and let the Reader judge.

“ I now proceed (says he \*) to shew in  
 “ a more general Way, the blameable  
 “ NATURE, and DESIGN [observe *That*  
 “ again] of the Doctor's Discourse.” Very  
 well; let us see how he shews it. “ The  
 “ whole Christian World, from the Time  
 “ of our Saviour to this Day, has been  
 “ praying, *thy Kingdom come, &c.* The  
 “ *Fall* of Man brought forth the Kingdom  
 “ of this World, &c.” And so on for  
 three Pages, setting forth what fallen Man  
*is*, and what He *ought to be*; then he pro-  
 ceeds thus. † “ Can we look upon the  
 “ Church of this Nation, as *drawing near*,  
 “ or even *tending* to this State of Perfec-  
 “ tion?” Yes, I hope, in *some Measure*;  
 tho' not near so much as it *should*, and as I  
*heartily wish*. “ Can we be carried to *any*  
 “ *one* Parish, either in *Town*, or *Country*,  
 “ where it can with Truth be said of any  
 “ *one* Pastor, and his *Flock*, that there the  
 “ Kingdom of God is *coming*, and his Will  
 “ *begins* to be done on Earth, as it is done  
 “ in Heaven?” I answer, again, yes; I  
 hope there is at least *one* Pastor, if not *one*  
 Flock,

\* P. 67.

† P. 71.

*Flock*, in whom the Kingdom of God is coming, and his Will *begins* to be done— Tho', according to this *bumble, meek, charitable* Gentleman, there is not *one Parish Priest* of the Church of *England*, who so much as *begins* to be a good Christian. He *himself* is not a *Parish Priest*: So all may be safe *there*. "Can we therefore find  
 " any *one Parish* where the *Pastor* has not  
 " great Reason to reject the Doctor's Discourse, and to pray both for *Himself*,  
 " and his *Flock*, that they may enter much  
 " farther into the *Spirit*, and *Practice* of  
 " Christianity, than they have yet enter'd,  
 " &c." Do I teach that it is not their Duty to enter much farther—than they have yet enter'd? He goes on in his old Track, blundering, and *supposing* me to say what I do not say. *Because* Some may think they are not obliged to This, or That; therefore my Discourse must be rejected, in which I affirm no such Thing, but the contrary.

P. 71, 72. "If the Case be thus, if we  
 " stand at this amazing Distance from that  
 " State of *Perfection*,—— does not *Heaven* and *Earth* seem to call upon every  
 " Minister of the Gospel to take to *himself* some Share of this miserable State of  
 " Things, and endeavour to convince both  
 " *Himself* and his *Flock*, that they have  
 " not yet been Christians in *true earnest*,  
 " that



“ that they have professed Christ with the  
 “ Temper of *Jews*, and *Heathens*, that  
 “ they have not entered into the narrow  
 “ *Way* that leads to Life, &c.” So that  
 all the Ministers of the Gospel (meaning in  
 the Church of *England*) not one excepted,  
 are not Christians in true earnest; they pro-  
 fess Christ with the Tempers of *Jews*, and  
*Heathens*; and have not yet so much as  
 enter’d into the narrow Way that leads to  
 Life. And thus he persists, for nine Pages  
 together, calumniating, catechizing, repre-  
 hending, instructing, exhorting, vilifying,  
 and abusing, the whole Body of the Clergy;  
 laying the prodigious Wickedness of This  
 Age, and Nation, in a very great measure,  
 at THEIR Door. I shall not trouble myself  
 to transcribe several wonderful Expressions,  
 and Assertions, contain’d in those Pages \*.  
 Let him, who thinks fit, read them, and  
 consider them. I only observe in this  
 Place, and upon this Occasion, that the  
*Methodists*, and *Enthusiasts* of all Sorts, (like  
 the other Schismatics, Hereticks, Papists,  
 Infidels, and Atheists) level their Artillery  
 against the *Establish’d Church* of *England*;  
 and none more, among them, than Those  
 who are *Clergymen themselves*. As to my-  
 self; I think they do me a great deal of  
 Honour, while in their eight Pamphlets  
 upon that poor Discourse of mine, their

K

*Spight*

\* From P. 72; to P. 80.

*Spight* against the *Church*, and *Clergy* of *England* in *general*, is so emphatically express'd against *Me* in *particular*. But to return: Our Author is now upon a new Topick: And a strange one it is.

P. 80. "To ask whether the Assistance  
" of the Holy Spirit is to be *ordinary*, or  
" *extraordinary* is as needless and ground-  
" less a Distinction——I thought now it  
was a very *needful*, and *well-grounded* Dis-  
tinction; and that there is much Difference  
between the *ordinary* Grace of God, and *ex-  
traordinary* Inspiration, like that of the  
*Apostles*, who had the Gift of Tongues, and  
the Power of working Miracles——

"As to ask whether a *Minister* of the  
" Gospel ought to be an *ordinary*, or  
" *extraordinary* good Man." The Cases  
are very different; as any one *in his Senses*  
may easily perceive. But upon this Sub-  
ject, from P. 80 to P. 84. he all along con-  
founds *ordinary* Sanctification with *extra-  
ordinary* Inspiration, and *supernatural*  
*Powers*, like Those of the *Apostles*. Thus  
P. 81. "And all the Assistance or Renova-  
" tion of the Holy Spirit which an *Apostle*  
" might expect, for the raising his own *per-  
sonal Holiness* to its greatest Height, or  
" for enabling him with *Spirit*, and *Power*,  
" to move, affect, and convert the Hearts  
" of Men to the Faith of the Gospel may  
" be *justly expected* now by such Ministers  
" of

“ of the Gospel as do all that which an  
 “ Apostle did to obtain, and receive it.”  
 So again, P. 82, in his Comparison be-  
 tween the *Assistances* of *human Learning*,  
 and the *Assistances* of *Divine Grace*; in-  
 stead of, between *human Learning*, and  
*extraordinary, Supernatural Powers*, as the  
*Gift of Tongues*, &c. Where, by the way,  
 he has these Words. “ Does an *Editor* of  
 “ *Terence*, *Horace*, or *Virgil*, receive such  
 “ *Illumination* from *Plays*, and *Poetry* ?”  
 These *Terence's*, *Horace's*, and *Virgil's*,  
*Plays*, and *Poetry*, run in his Head strange-  
 ly. As for immoral *Plays*, and *Playhouses*  
 as they now are; I detest them as heartily as  
 hecando. But notwithstanding his Aversion  
 to Poetry, and the Classics, and all critical,  
 and polite Learning; should such *Studies*,  
 and such *Authors* be laid aside, the noble  
 and sacred Science of *Theology*, nay the  
*Christian Religion* itself would be greatly  
 prejudiced by it: And *Ignorance*, and *Stu-*  
*pidity*, *Heresy*, and *Infidelity*, *Enthusiasm*,  
 and *Atheism* would prevail, even more than  
 they do at present. “ Do *Cardinals*, and  
 “ *Pluralists* [prettily coupled!] receive  
 “ so much *Uction*, and *Assistance* from  
 “ *human Establishments* as to need less to  
 “ be led and govern'd by the *holy Spirit* of  
 “ *God*? Or will we say, that a *critical*  
 “ *Study* of *divided Languages*, [divided  
 “ *Languages*? what *Language* is that?] and

“ a Religion established in worldly *Ease*,  
 “ and *Peace* [He seems mightily troubled  
 at the *human Establishment*, the *Ease*, and  
*Peace* of the Church and Religion:] “ are  
 “ not only in themselves free from *Danger*,  
 “ and *Corruption*; but have so much of  
 “ the *Nature* of the *Holy Spirit* of God in  
 “ them, that they can be to us in *his* stead,  
 “ and make his *sanctifying Operations* up-  
 “ on us needed in a *less Degree*? Again,  
 P. 83. “ If the *Holy Spirit* does not Now  
 “ in *such a Degree* renew, quicken, move,  
 “ and *sanctify* our Hearts, and fill us with  
 “ such Degrees of divine *Light*, and *Love*  
 “ as was done in the *first Ages* of the  
 “ *Church*; it is not because this *sanctifying*  
 “ *Spirit* has committed *some Part* of his  
 “ *Work* to *human Learning*, and so is be-  
 “ come only our *Sanctifier* in a lesser, and  
 “ *ordinary Degree*, &c.” P. 84. “ If therefore we have—any De-  
 “ fire—to satisfy the Wants and Necessi-  
 “ ties of our Flocks, &c.” OUR FLOCKS?  
 Where is *his* Flock folded? I never heard  
 he had *any*. He has not any Employment  
 of That Kind himself; and so is more at  
 leisure to abuse Those who *have*. After  
 this, he resumes his Instructions, Repri-  
 mands, and Exhortations to the Clergy for  
 nine Pages more; (in which, among several  
 other crude, wild, and false Assertions, he  
 has



has This, \* That the Office of *Priesthood* is *honourable*, only in the same Sense as (*suffering Martyrdom* is honourable) and then proceeds thus.

P. 94, 95. " I believe I need not now help the Reader to observe that the Doctor's Undertaking is further liable to these great Objections against it." By the Word *further* one would imagine here should be something quite *new*: And yet 'tis little, or nothing, more than a nauseous Repetition of what He has *said*, and I have *answer'd*, and *expos'd* ten times over already. "*First*, that it calls us from the *Sin*, and *Danger* of being righteous *over-much*; when we are always to own that *we are not righteous enough*." I answer, first, some Readers perhaps may understand these Words as implying that I had not sufficiently guarded against *not being righteous enough*. If they do, I desire them to consider the very last Words of my Discourse; besides many other Passages in it already taken notice of. "*But let us not, to avoid Enthusiasm, fall into Coldness, or Luke-warmness in Religion; nor be too little righteous, for Fear of being righteous over-much*." To be *too little* righteous, and *not to be righteous enough*, are, to my Apprehension, the same Thing. Secondly, If by our *not being righteous enough*

*enough* he means that the Righteousness  
 even of the *Best* is not *perfect*; but the Me-  
 rits of *Jesus Christ* are necessary to supply  
 its Defects; what he says is *true*, tho' no-  
 thing to his *Purpose*. If he means that *We*  
 [*We* indefinitely, *i. e.* *All*] are not righ-  
 teous enough to be *saved*; it is *false*, and  
*frantick*. Thousands, *very many* Thou-  
 sands, it is to be hop'd, and I verily be-  
 lieve, are in that Sense *righteous enough*.  
 Thirdly, A Person who is *righteous over-*  
*much* is in an *Extrame*, in *Excess*, in *Sin*;  
 and for that *very Reason not righteous e-*  
*nough*. However the Words may sound, he  
 who *seems* to *over-do* his Duty in this Sense,  
*really*, and in Truth, *under-does* it; or (if  
 you please) does it not *at all*; I mean *so far*,  
 or in *that respect*. “ *Secondly*, (says he)  
 “ that it proposes to stir us up against this  
 “ *Sin* and *Danger*, at a Time when this  
 “ Nation is in Danger of the severest Judg-  
 “ ments of God upon it, for a *general Ir-*  
 “ *religion*, and *Profaneness*.” But cannot  
 it be in Danger from *Both*? From  
*Profaneness* on the one hand, from *Enthu-*  
*siasm* on the other? So much has been  
 said upon This, both in my Sermons, and  
 in the Pamphlet before referred to; that I  
 shall add no more, only transcribe a few  
 Words from the latter. “ He [*Dr. Trapp*]  
 “ has shewn the Danger of *both* Extremes,  
 “ and particularly that *over-much Righ-*  
 “ *teousness*

" *debauchery* encourages *Profaneness*, and  
 " *Debauchery*, *Infidelity*, and *Atheism*. All  
 " the World knows they play into each  
 " other's Hands ; and do the Devil's Busi-  
 " ness between them." \* Let it be ob-  
 served, in passing, that when I mention  
*Profaneness* as opposite to *Enthusiasm* ; I  
 use the first Word in its more common, and  
 popular Signification : For *Enthusiasm* it-  
 self is in truth extremely *profane* ; and  
*blasphemous* too : Of which I have, in this  
 very *Reply*, given many shameful and scan-  
 dalous Instances.

He says my Discourse tends " *Thirdly*,  
 " to lead the *Clergy* from a just Sense of  
 " what the Nature of their Office, the Na-  
 " ture of Religion, and the present State  
 " of this Nation requires of them. It tends  
 " to raise an *ill Spirit* in them, not only to  
 " be content with an ordinary Degree of  
 " Piety in themselves, and their Flocks,  
 " but with a *watchful* and *jealous* Eye to  
 " guard against all the *Beginnings* of un-  
 " common, or more than ordinary Sanctity  
 " of Life, either in themselves, or others."  
 Absolutely false in every Particular ; as ap-  
 pears from what I have over, and over  
 shewn already : However, something more  
 shall be added in this Place. He cites these  
 Words of mine, *To what a Height of Fa-*  
*natick Madness in Doctrine as well as*  
*Practise,*

*Practise, are some advanced, who set out at first with an Appearance of more than ordinary Sanctity in Practise only?* Then subjoins. “Is not this calling upon the *Clergy* to beware how they admit these *Beginnings* of a more than ordinary Sanctity, either in themselves, or those committed to their Care?” No; nothing like it. This Passage he had perverted Before; and I thought I had said enough of it. [See backwards, P. 17, 18.] Yet now he has it over again, with a new Turn of Misrepresentation, and Falshood. Do I say a Word about “the *Beginnings* of a more than ordinary Sanctity of Life either in themselves, [the *Clergy*] or those committed to their Care?” I say, the *Appearance*, i. e. the false Show of it, in the Persons themselves; for I mention nothing of any besides themselves; nor do I there speak of *Clergymen* in particular. Is an *Appearance* of Sanctity the same as the *Beginning* of Sanctity? This Man *thinks* so, or *talks as if* he thought so: Take it which way you will, is such a one fit to be disputed with? “Is it not (continues he) *plainly* telling them that they must stick *closely*, and *steadily* to such Sanctity of *Practise* as may be called *ordinary*; or else they will be in Fanatick Madness?” The *Argument* stands thus. I tell the *World in general*, that some who set out at  
first



first with an Appearance of more than ordinary Sanctity in *Practise only* are come to a great Height of Fanatick Madness, both in Doctrine, and Practise: *Therefore* I tell the *Clergy in particular*, "that they" must stick *closely*, and *steddily* to such "Sanctity of Practise as may be call'd ordinary; or else they will be in Fanatick Madness." He goes on. "Here is no Force put upon his Words: A more than ordinary Sanctity in Practise only is mark'd out, &c." As a Man may be certainly said to have some Force put upon him, when an Enemy, or a Robber cuts off one of his Arms, or Thighs; so, I think, Words may be truly said to have some Force put upon them, when they are mangled, and mutilated; when some one, or more of them being left out, the Sense of those which remain is entirely changed. I said, an Appearance (i. e. Show, mere Show) of a more than ordinary Sanctity: This Man quotes me, as saying a more than ordinary Sanctity; dropping Those Words an Appearance of, as if they signified just nothing. Yet there is no Force put upon my Words; none in the World. It is observable too that Here, and in his other Quotation of this Passage, when he goes about to make his own Use of it, he retains the Word *only* after the Word *Practise*, most absurdly, and ridiculously; so as to make a Piece of Nonsense for me, which

I never made for myself. The Word, as I used it, was *proper*, and even *necessary*; Doctrine *as well as* Practice being opposed to Practice *only*. But as He, in perverting the Passage, drops That Distinction, he makes the Word *only* to be downright Nonsense. "Here is no Force (says he) put up—" on his Words; a more than ordinary "Sanctity in Practice *only* is mark'd out—" Unless (which indeed, upon second Thoughts, I take to be his real Design) he would represent the Word *only* as agreeing with *more than ordinary Sanctity*, as thus; "*only* " a more than ordinary Sanctity in Practice " is mark'd out as the genuine natural " Cause of Fanatick Madness." And what a Perversion of Words that is, let *any* Reader determine. Be that as it may; a more than ordinary Sanctity, it seems, is by me " *mark'd out* as the genuine natural CAUSE " of *fanatick Madness*; and therefore the " CAUSE is equally condemn'd with the " EFFECT:" That is, a *more than ordinary Sanctity* is by me equally condemned with *Fanatick Madness*. 1<sup>st</sup>, I say again, that I do not speak of a *more than ordinary Sanctity*; but of the *Appearance* of it. 2<sup>dly</sup>, I do not say that even *That* is the *Cause* of Fanatick Madness. Do I use the Word *Cause*, or any thing like it? Cannot two Things *coexist*, or the one *follow* the other; without their having the Relation

tion of *Cause*, and *Effect* between them? But as our Author's Argumentations, in all his Works which I above mention'd, perpetually proceed upon the grossest and filliciest *Fallacies*, such as *Petitio Principii*, *Ignoratio Elenchi*, *Fallacia Accidentis*, *A dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, &c. which even *natural Logick*, without the Assistance of *artificial*, might pretty well guard against; So he here falls into another ridiculous *Paralogism*, That of *Non causa pro causa*. "Had he meant (says He) that his Reader should not have the same *Dislike* of the "one as of the other," [i. e. of a *more than ordinary Sanctity*, as of *Fanatick Madness*] "or had he been afraid of his doing so; "would he not have put in a Word in "Favour of a *more than ordinary Sancti-* "ty of Life; would he not have said that "he did not intend to *blame* That, or at "least not *so much* as the other?" Once more, I was not There speaking of a *more than ordinary Sanctity*, but of the *Appearance* of it: And I once more tell this Gentleman (and intreat him not to forget it) that the *Appearance* of a Thing, and the *Thing itself* are not the same. Besides; I have in other Parts of my Discourse said *much* in Favour of a *more than ordinary Sanctity*; if a Sanctity, according to the *strictest Precepts* of the Gospel, may be called so. "But not a Word of This (con-

“tinues He) a more than ordinary Sancti-  
 “ty in Practice *only*, and Fanatick Mad-  
 “ness, are consider’d as *Cause* and *Effect* ;  
 “and left in the same State of Condem-  
 “nation, to be *equally* guarded against, and  
 “avoided by the Reader.” I appeal to  
 That Reader, whoever he be, provided  
 only he be in *his Senses*, and able to *dis-*  
*tinguish* the most *distinct Things* from one  
 another ; whether This be not an In-  
 stance of shameful *Ignorance*, or *more* shame-  
 ful *Fraud* and *Calumny*.

P. 96. to P. 102. “And here I can’t  
 “help addressing myself, *with great Affec-*  
 “*tion*, to all *my younger Brethren* of the  
 “*Clergy*.” Mighty *solemn*, and *gracious* !  
 He had Before liberally bestow’d his Re-  
 prehensions, Instructions, and Exhortations  
 upon the Clergy in general : Now, for se-  
 ven Pages more, with the same *Episcopal*,  
 or rather *Apostolical* Air of Pastoral Love,  
 and *Superintendency*, he admonishes the  
 younger Clergy in particular : Who, I  
 hope, will have more *Grace*, and more  
*Sense*, than to take his Advice. *Most* of  
 it, I mean : For *some* of it is very good ;  
 tho’ I think it does not *become* Him to  
*give* it. Who made *Him* a *Censor*, and *In-*  
*structor*, over the whole Body of the Cler-  
 gy ? For such a one as He is, or for any  
 private Person whatsoever, to *assume* at This  
 Rate, is, in my Opinion, contrary to all  
*Decency* ;



*Decency*; nay, not only *indecent*, but very *sinful*; contrary to the *Temper* and *Spirit* of the Gospel, to the *Modesty*, and *Humility* of the Christian Religion. Let him cease to dream that the *Care of all the Churches* lies upon *Him*; let him *reflect less upon other People's Behaviour*, and take *more Care of his own*. The greatest Part of his Instructions to the younger Clergy is in the same Frantick Strain with his *Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration*, and his *Account of the Christian Religion* here in *This Pamphlet*: Of both which I have already taken so much Notice. "The Book of all Books (says He\*) is your *own Heart*; " in which are written, and engraven the " deepest Lessons of divine Instruction: " Learn therefore to be deeply attentive " to the *Presence of God in your Hearts*; " who is always *speaking*, &c. Here you " will meet the *divine Light* in its proper " *Place*, in that *Depth of your Souls*, where " the *Birth of the Son of God*, and the " *Proceeding of the Holy Ghost* are *always* " *ready to spring up in you*. — † God is " an *all-speaking, all-working, all-illumi-* " *nating* Essence, possessing the *Depth*, " &c." With a deal more to the same Purpose; if That can be said to be to *any* Purpose, which has no Meaning. "This (adds he) is not *Enthusiasm*." Yes, but it

\* P. 98, 99.

† P. 101, 102.

it is, say I; if ever there was *Enthusiasm* in the World, — “ But the Words of Truth “ and Soberness.” This He *affirms*, and This I *deny*: They are not the Words of *Truth and Soberness*; but the Words of *Falsbood, and Frenzy*.

“ You are enter’d (says He \*) into *holy Orders* in degenerate Times, *where* [I “ should have said *when*] *Trade and Traffick* have seiz’d upon *ALL holy Things*; “ And it will be easy for you without Fear “ to swim along the *corrupt Stream*, and “ to look upon him as an Enemy, or *Enthusiast*, that would *save* You from being lost in it.” How great is the *Decorum*, the *Humility*, the *Modesty*, and the *Charity* of This! † “ But think, my dear “ Brethren, think in Time, what *Remorse* “ you are treasuring up for yourselves, if “ you live to *look back* upon a loose, negligent, corrupt, disorderly, worldly, unedifying Life, spent among Those whose “ Blood will be required at your Hands.” I hope *all* the Clergy, both *young*, and *old*, and *middle-aged*, do, or will, think deeply of This, and behave themselves accordingly: Doubtless it greatly behoves them so to do; And dreadful will be their *Condemnation*, if they do not. But will not the *Offices for Ordering Deacons, and Priests*, in the *Common-Prayer Book*, the *Charges*,

*Charges, Instructions, and Exhortations* of our *Bishops* at their *Visitations*, so many excellent *Ordination-Sermons*, and *Visitation-Sermons*, (the incomparable *Bishop Bull's* especially, which sure is *strict enough*, tho' not *too strict*) will not all these sufficiently remind the Clergy of their Duty; without *This Man's* taking upon him in so *extraordinary*, and *unprecedented* a Manner? \* "Lay this down (says he) for an infallible Principle; that an *entire, absolute RENUNCIATION* of ALL *Worldly Interest* is the ONLY POSSIBLE Foundation of That exalted Vertue which your Station requires." This indeed is the *Doctrine* of his *Treatise upon Christian Perfection*; there impos'd upon Christians in common, Laity, as well as Clergy. And I affirm 'tis *false Doctrine*; not taught by the Christian Religion; but tending to the Reproach, and Scandal of it. "Detest therefore with the *utmost Abhorrence* ALL Desires of making your Fortunes either by *Preferments*, or *rich Marriages*." This is of a Piece with the Passage last cited; and I say the same of This, as of That. † "Consider yourselves MERELY as the Messengers of God, and SOLELY sent into the World on this Errand" The same Answer again: It is false to say that Clergymen ought to mind *nothing*, in any degree,

\* Ibid.

*degree*, but their *Profession*, and Duty as Clergymen. They are *Husbands*, *Parents*, *Men*, as well as *Clergymen*; and *must* in some measure *be concern'd* in the Affairs of the World.

P. 98. " I don't call you from a *sober*  
 " *Use* of human Learning." This he says;  
 but then he says many Things inconsistent  
 with it: as Those, who *talk*, and *write*  
 without *thinking*, are upon all Occasions  
 extremely prone to *contradict themselves*.  
 His very next Words are These. " But I  
 " would fain persuade you to think No-  
 " THING worthy of your Notice in *Books*,  
 " and *Study*, but that which DIRECTLY  
 " applies to the Amendment of the Heart,  
 " &c." The Studies of Languages, of  
 History, of Philosophy, of Philology, tend  
 not *directly* (tho' they may *indirectly*) to  
 the Amendment of the Heart, &c. And  
 yet if these Studies are laid aside; what  
 becomes of human Learning? So again  
 within three Lines. " You want NOTHING  
 " but to have the *Corruption* of your na-  
 " tural Birth remov'd, &c." And cannot  
 This be done without human Learning?  
 If so; what will become of the *World*; of  
 all *Christians*, except one in ten thousand at  
 most? " This [to have the *Corruption*—  
 " remov'd] is the ONLY certain Way to  
 " become *eminent Divines*." If That be  
 the Case; any good *Christian* may be as  
 eminent



*eminent a Divine* as the most *learned Cler-*  
*gyman* in Christendom: Therefore what  
 does Learning signify in a Clergyman? Yet  
 he tells the young Clergy that " he does  
 " not call them from a *sober Use* of human  
 " *Learning*:" Whereas, at this rate, he  
 calls them from *all* Use of it. So again,  
 P. 100, 101. " Your cleansed Hearts—will  
 " be always penetrated—and you will no  
 " more need the *Criticks* to tell you what  
 " God speaks to you in the Scriptures—  
 " There are indeed in the Scriptures *Secrets*,  
 " and *Mysteries*——But of all Men in  
 " the World, the *critical Dealers* in *Words*,  
 " and *Particles*, KNOW THE LEAST of them;  
 [less, to be sure, than every Weaver, or  
 Cobler;] " and make the *vainest Attempts*  
 " to understand them. But Scripture, con-  
 " sider'd as a Doctrine of *Life, Faith*, and  
 " *Salvation* in *Jesus Christ*, is a *sealed*, or  
 " *unsealed*, an *open*, or *shut up* Book to  
 " every Heart, in the same Proportion as  
 " it stands turn'd to the World, or turn'd  
 " to God. Nothing understands God, but  
 " the Spirit of God; nothing brings the  
 " Spirit of God into any Mind, but the  
 " renouncing ALL for it, the turning WHOL-  
 " LY to it, and the depending WHOLLY  
 " upon it." What then, I ask once more,  
 does *human Learning* signify? Can none  
 but *Scholars* do all this? Yet he says again  
 in the very next Words; " Human Learn-  
 M " ing

"ing is by no means to be rejected from  
 "Religion." It is to be rejected *from* it,  
 I think; if it be of no Use *in* it. Why  
 This Sentence was inserted, I see not; un-  
 less it were to *strengthen* the *Self-Contra-*  
*diction* afore said. Then to strengthen it  
 yet farther, he adds: "For it is of the  
 "same good Use, and Service, and affords  
 "the same Assistance to Religion, that the  
 "Alphabet, Writing, and Printing does."  
 I should rather have said that human  
 Learning affords Assistance to Religion (tho'  
 not just *the same* Assistance) as the *Alpha-*  
*bet, Writing, and Printing* do, both to  
*human Learning*, and to *all Knowledge*  
 whatsoever. He goes on. "But if it be  
 "raised from this *Kind, and Degree* of  
 "Assistance," [that is, of being just as  
 Assistant to Religion, as the *Alphabet, Wri-*  
*ting, and Printing* are: Whereas, accord-  
 ing to his own Account before, it should be  
 somewhat *more* so; because the *Unlearned*  
*can read, and write too:*] "If it is consider'd  
 "as a Key, or the Key [*a Key* I con-  
 ceive it is, tho' not *the Key, or the only*  
 Key; because the Assistance of God's Spirit  
 must concur] "to the *Mysteries* of our  
 "Redemption in *Jesus Christ*; instead of  
 "opening to us the Kingdom of God, it  
 "locks us up in our own *Darkness*." If it  
 be not so much as a Key, that is, *some* Key,  
 or other, to *open*; but *locks up*, instead of  
 opening;

opening: certainly it is so far from *assisting* Religion in any *Sense*, in any *Degree*; that it *hinders* Religion. And yet he tells us, "*Human Learning* is by no means to be *rejected from Religion*." Again, P. 102. after those Words quoted above, "This is *not Enthusiasm, &c.*" he adds; "And it is the running away from *This Enthusiasm* that has made so many great *Schools* as useless to the Church as *tinkling Cymbals*, and ALL Christendom a mere *Babel* of learned Confusion." All Christendom; as *universal* as may be. *Learned Confusion*, when *Learning* is *falsely* so called, or made an *ill Use* of, is, I acknowledge, a thing to be conceived: But a *Babel* of *ignorant*, and *unlearned Confusion*, is much *more likely* to happen, and much *worse*, when it *does* happen. But whatever is to be said of That; I ask whether This be not an *Invective* against *human Learning*? in Religion at least? To say the Truth, his Pamphlet (whenever it touches upon this Subject, as it often does) is a fanatical, infamous *Libel* upon *Learning*, and *learned Men*: It is plain he *perfectly hates* Both: And whenever he thoughtlessly commits to Paper any Words which *seem* to imply something in Favour of Learning; he does but *contradict himself*, as I *said*, and *have proved*, Before.

At the Conclusion \*, he pretends to vindicate himself from *my Misquotations* of his Words, in some Passages which I reflected upon in my Discourse. “ I must now (says he) take notice of an *injurious Quotation*, or two, that the Doctor has made from the *Treatise of Christian Perfection*.” Here again, if I have *not* misrepresented, and injur’d *Him*; He *has* misrepresented, and injur’d *Me*: As he has, in *every thing* he has said hitherto. I would not *misquote*, or any way *misrepresent*, the *Words*, or *Sense*, of *any* Person living, even the *worst* that ever liv’d, for all that this World can afford: Because I take it to be one of the worst Species of *Lying*; one Species of *Forgery*; a *Villany*, of which none but the *basest*, and *vilest* of *Wretches* can be guilty. Then ’tis as *foolish*, and *stupid*, as ’tis *wicked*; if the Writer thus injur’d be *living*, and have but the Gift of Common Sense: Because he will not fail, in his own Vindication, to *detect*, and *expose*, both the *Lie*, and the *Liar*. “ The Doctor (continues he) quotes me as affirming, *that not only the Wickedness, and Vanity of this World, but even its most lawful, and allow’d Concerns, render Men unable to enter, and unworthy to be received into the true State of Christianity*. And again, *That the Wisdom* “ *from*

\* P. 102, 103—107.



“ from above condemns all Labour, as  
 “ equally fruitless, but That which la-  
 “ bours after everlasting Life.” Well; I  
 do quote him as affirming this; and does  
 he not affirm it? Are they not his own  
 Words to a tittle? Have I misquoted one  
 Syllable? Does the Man himself so much  
 as pretend I have? Where then is the in-  
 jurious Quotation? Can a true Quotation  
 be an injurious one? Words indeed truly  
 quoted may be afterwards wrested, and  
 perverted by a false Sense, or false Glosses  
 put upon them; or be abused by false  
 Consequences drawn from them. These,  
 however, are widely different from inju-  
 rious Quotations: But what is there in  
 any thing I have said that even looks like  
 either of these? Our Author adds, in the  
 very next Words; “ Then the Doctor af-  
 “ firms thus; *here’s an utter Condemna-*  
 “ *tion of all Trades, and of all Profes-*  
 “ *sions, of all Business, and secular Con-*  
 “ *cerns whatever.*” Why could he not  
 cite my Words exactly? I said *whatso-*  
*ever*, not *whatever*. In Answer to This,  
 he says; “ Does the Doctor then believe  
 “ that I bought Pen, Ink, and Paper,  
 “ and wrote that Book, to shew that no  
 “ Christian ought to *make, buy, or sell*  
 “ Pen, Ink, and Paper? and that I pub-  
 “ lish’d that Book to prove that it was my  
 “ Opinion that it was utterly unlawful for

“ a Christian to be a *Printer, Bookbinder,*  
 “ or *Bookseller?*” What have I to do  
 with HIS buying *Pen, Ink, and Paper,*  
*Sc.* and with HIS *Design of writing, and*  
*publishing* This, or That? He says what I  
*say* he says; and if he is pleas'd to *contra-*  
*dict himself* (as he perpetually does) what  
 is that to *Me?* Does the Doctor believe  
 that I bought *Pen, Ink, and Paper, Sc?*  
 This the Doctor *believes*; that *Pen, Ink,*  
 and *Paper* were never before employ'd in  
 such *impertinent, and insolent Foppery.*  
 “ Does not the Doctor know (continues he)  
 “ that the *Christian Perfection* in the two  
 “ first Pages, to prevent all Mistake, open-  
 “ ly declares for the *Continuance* of all  
 “ Mankind in their several States and Con-  
 “ ditions, openly declares against a *Cloy-*  
 “ *ster, or any singular State* of Life, open-  
 “ ly asserts Christian Perfection to consist  
 “ in the *holy, and religious* Conduct of our-  
 “ selves in *every State* of Life?” I an-  
 swer, first, Neither I, nor any body else,  
 can make *consistent Sense* of the *indigested*  
*Crudities* in those Pages. *Stating* is a Task  
 that requires *distinct, and accurate Think-*  
*ing*; to which He is an utter Stranger.  
 Secondly, suppose he had *There, or any*  
*where else,* never so expressly said the *Con-*  
*trary* to what he *Here* says; still he *does*  
*say* what I quoted: And the *Consequence* I  
 deduce *immediately, and directly* follows.  
 And

And if he can't live without *contradicting himself*, what is That to Me again? "Does he not know that in the *Serious Call to a Devout Life, &c.* [THE (not MY) *Serious Call*, and so all along, THE *Treatise upon Christian Perfection*; to shew the *Supereminency* of His Works:] "which presently followed the other Book, the very Title declares solely for a *Piety adapted to the State, and Condition of all Orders of Men?*" I answer, No; His *Christian Perfection* was more than enough: I never read his *Serious Call*; and never intend to read it. Perhaps it may be his Opinion that *All* are bound to read whatever *He* is pleas'd to write: But I think otherwise. Besides; I here give the same Answer, which I gave more than once Before: If He *contradicts himself*, that is nothing to Me.

P. 104. "But there is something still more wonderful, more *regardless of Right, and Wrong*, in the Doctor's Charge against me: For in this very Passage quoted by Him, secular Business is expressly affirm'd to be *most lawful, and allow'd Concerns*. And yet from this Passage affirming the Lawfulness of worldly Business, and proceeding upon it as a certain Truth, *the Doctor has extracted* the Unlawfulness of all secular Concerns whatever." How have I *extracted* it?

Does

Does he not *expressly* say, that all these things, be they what they will, render Men *unable to enter, &c.* ? and that *the Wisdom from above condemns ALL LABOUR, but that which labours after everlasting Life* ? What is This, but *an utter Condemnation of all Trades, of all Business, and secular Concerns whatsoever* ? Yes ; but he mentions (for he does not *expressly* affirm, &c. as he here falsely says he does) *most lawful, and allow'd Concerns*. This indeed is another Instance of his *contradicting himself* : For how That can be *most lawful and allow'd*, which *hinders us from entering* into the Kingdom of Heaven, I cannot imagine. But still, these worldly Concerns, whether *lawful, and allow'd*, or not, He says, *do so hinder us* : Therefore when I *quoted him as saying so*, I did him no *Injury*. “ Again, Does not the Doctor “ know that he *designedly mangled* the “ Words he quoted ? ” — No ; but I *know the contrary* ; I know I did *not design* to mangle them ; and I know *I have not mangled them*. — “ And left out THAT PART “ which shew'd the REASON of my so *expressing myself* ? ” What Part ? What Reason ? I can find nothing of this. But however ; what signifies it how his Assertion is *introduced* ? Still he *makes* the Assertion which I quoted ; and moreover what he says to introduce it is *false* ; and he asserts



serts That *Falshood* by another *Self-contradiction*. \* “ We have farther Representation of the *Contrariety* that there is between *this Kingdom* [Christ’s] and the *Concerns of this World*: *A certain Man*, *saith our Lord*, *made a great Supper*, *&c.*” First, I say, ’tis *false* that this Parable represents a *Contrariety* between Christ’s Kingdom, and the *Concerns of this World*: Between That Kingdom, and an *immoderate Care* for the *Concerns of this World*, if he pleases. Secondly, Here again he *contradicts himself*. If the *Concerns of this World* (absolutely) be contrary to Christ’s Kingdom; how can any of its *Concerns* be *lawful*, and *allow’d*? Which yet (as we have seen) he affirms some of them may; tho’ indeed he affirms it by another *Self-contradiction*. In his Pamphlet he proceeds thus. † “ That I was there [in his *Christian Perfection*] speaking to that Parable of our Lord’s, where all that were bidden to the Feast refused to come. The *first*, because he had *bought a Piece of Ground*, &c. Whence I thus observed; *This Parable teaches us, that not only the Vices, and Vanity of the World, but its most lawful, and allow’d Concerns render Men unable to enter, &c.*” They may, it is true, by *Accident*, by *Abuse*; But he says *absolutely*,

N

\* *Christ. Perf.* P. 70. † *Answer*, P. 104.

lutely, simply, THE Concerns, &c. render Men unable, &c. In the next Words indeed (*Christ. Perf. P. 71.*) He is inconsistent with himself, according to his Custom. "That he who is busy'd in  
 " an honest, and lawful Calling MAY  
 " on that Account be as well rejected,  
 " &c." But before, in the Words I quoted he spoke absolutely. "\* And does not  
 " every one see this [*viz. that the World's most lawful, and allowed Concerns render Men incapable to enter, &c.*] " to be the  
 " plain, necessary, and inoffensive Sense of  
 " the Parable?" I answer, No; Every body that has good Eyes sees the contrary.  
 " Had I not made Nonsense of it, if I had  
 " said, that *lawful Business* COULD NOT  
 " become a Hindrance of Men's Salvation?"  
 Yes; and so you have made Nonsense of it the other Way. It is equally false, and absurd, to say that they *are* Hindrances, and that they *cannot become* Hindrances. There is a *Medium* between these two; and what that *Medium* is, I have just now shewn. In *themselves* they *are not* Hindrances; but *may become so*, by *Accident*, by the *ill Use* that is made of them. "Then (says he) I  
 " go on to shew that it is not the *Employ-*  
 " *ment itself* that is condemn'd, but its  
 " being made a *Reason*, or *Excuse*, as in  
 " the Parable for not living WHOLLY unto  
 " God." If we must live WHOLLY unto  
 \* Answer, P. 105. God,

God, in the *strictest* Sense, (and he makes no Distinction, or Limitation) then, in my Opinion, we must have nothing to do with secular Affairs; which yet he teaches we *may* do: tho' I acknowledge he likewise teaches we may *not*: according to his usual *Consistency with himself*. But let That pass, as a Trifle. I find he can, to serve his own Turn, *misquote* HIMSELF, as well as ME. Where does he *go on* to *shew* This? He has nothing to shew that it is *not the Employment itself that is condemn'd*; but much to the contrary; and that in stronger Words than any I cited from him.

" \* It farther teaches us that Christianity  
 " is a Calling that PUTS AN END TO ALL  
 " OTHER CALLINGS." " † But they don't  
 " consider that the *Business of the World*—  
 " is as *vain as Vanity itself*; they don't  
 " consider that the *Cares of an Employ-*  
 " *ment*, an Attention to Business, if it has  
 " *got hold of the Heart*, [and it must get  
 " *some* hold of the Heart, if it be *at all* mind-  
 " ed:] renders Men as vain, and odious in the  
 " sight of God, as any other Gratification.  
 " ‡ For tho' they may call it an *honest*  
 " *Care*, yet it is their particular Gratifica-  
 " tion; and a Wisdom that can no more  
 " recommend itself to the Eyes of God,  
 " than the Wisdom of an *Epicure*. § " For  
 " the World is full as important in its

N 2

" Pleasures,

\* *Christ. Perf.* P. 72. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* § P. 73.

“ *Pleasures*, as in its *Cares*, there is no  
 “ more Wisdom in the one than in the  
 “ other.” Its *Pleasures* he all along con-  
 demns : And if its *Cares* (its *Cares abso-*  
*lutely*, without any *Exception*, or *Distinc-*  
*tion* as to Degrees, for so he puts it) be no  
 more important, and have no more Wisdom  
 in them, than its *Pleasures* ; he condemns  
 the *Cares* likewise. Well ; but he farther  
 says \* he has these Words, and it is true  
 he has. † “ Let but Religion determine  
 “ the Point ; and what can it signify whe-  
 “ ther a Man *forgets God* in his *Farm*, or  
 “ a *Shop*, or at a *Gaming Table* ?” How  
 properly are a *Farm*, and a *Shop*, men-  
 tion’d with a *Gaming Table* ! Does not this  
 look at least like a *Condemnation* of *Farms*,  
 and *Shops* ? A Man, I think, *must quite*  
*forget God* at a *Gaming Table* ; but he  
 need not in his *Farm*, or *Shop*. He may  
*there* think upon God very much, and lift  
 up his Heart to him by short Ejaculations,  
 Prayers, and Praises, even in the Midst of  
 his worldly Business. But however That  
 be ; still This Writer *says* what I *quoted* :  
 Nor did I any way *injure*, or *misrepresent*  
 him. “ Now what is there here condemn’d  
 “ (adds he ‡) but the *forgetting of God* ?”  
 I answer, he has condemn’d *much more*,  
 even *all* worldly Business, secular Callings,  
 and

\* *Answ.* P. 105. † *Perf.* P. 73. ‡ *Answ.* P. 105.



and Employments; as I have fully shewn: *Forgetting God* we had nothing of 'till now; and now it comes in only by the Bye.

The next Article is This. \* “ The Doctor proceeds to charge me with *positively asserting that all Christians, in all Ages, are obliged to sell all they have, and give it to the Poor.* I have been so far from asserting *This*, that I have with *all my Might* said, and prov'd the direct *Contrary*; that *no Christians of any Age are obliged to it.*” This is a surprizing Turn indeed. The Assertion consists of two Parts. First, That he has *not asserted This.* Secondly, That he has with all his Might said, and prov'd the *direct Contrary.* We begin with the Former.

After having cited † those Words of our Saviour to the young rich Man, *Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give it to the Poor*; he immediately writes thus. ‡ “ Some have imagined that from our Saviour’s using the Expression *if thou wilt be perfect*, that this was only a Condition of some *uncommon Perfection*, which Christians AS SUCH were not obliged to aspire after: But the WEAKNESS of *this Imagination* will appear, if it be consider’d, &c. || “ So that when our Saviour saith *if thou wilt be perfect*, it is the same thing

\* *Answ.* P. 105, 106.

† *Christ. Perf.* P. 88.

‡ P. 88, 89.

|| P. 89.

“ thing as when he said, *if thou wilt not*  
 “ *be lacking*—thou must not only keep  
 “ the Commandments, but *sell what thou*  
 “ *hast, and give it to the Poor.* It plain-  
 “ ly therefore appears that what is here  
 “ commanded is a CONDITION OF HIS BE-  
 “ ING A CHRISTIAN, &c. \* “ This Re-  
 “ mark, and the other—undeniably shew  
 “ us thus much, that what is here required  
 “ of *this young Man* is requir’d of ALL rich  
 “ Men IN ALL AGES of the Church.”  
 “ † Those who will still be fancying (for  
 “ there is nothing but Fancy to support it)  
 “ that this Command related *only to this*  
 “ *young Man*, ought to observe, &c.”  
 With more to the same Purpose towards  
 the Bottom of the Page. ‡ “ Because it  
 “ was a *Temper* NECESSARY FOR CHRISTIA-  
 “ NITY, and ALWAYS TO BE REQUIRED  
 “ OF ALL CHRISTIANS. || “ It ought to be  
 “ observed that when our Saviour com-  
 “ mandeth the young Man to SELL ALL,  
 “ AND GIVE IT TO THE POOR, he gives  
 “ this Reason for it, &c. § If this *selling*  
 “ *all*, this *Renunciation of all worldly*  
 “ *Wealth*, was not required for the Excel-  
 “ lency of the DUTY, and its SUITABLE-  
 “ NESS TO THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY;  
 “ it will be hard to shew, &c. \*\* I have  
 “ already shewn that the Thing required  
 “ of

\* P. 90.    † P. 91.    ‡ P. 92.    || P. 93.  
 § P. 94.    \*\* P. 104.

“ of this young Man was no *particular*  
 “ *Duty*; but that our Saviour PRESS'D IT  
 “ UPON ALL.” And much more in the  
 same Strain, P. 105, 106, &c. “ \* It will  
 “ now, I know, be asked whether ALL  
 “ Christians are obliged to *sell* their Estates,  
 “ and give to the Poor, &c? The Ab-  
 “ surdity and Ridiculousness of such a Thing,  
 “ &c.—As to the Absurdity and Ridicu-  
 “ lousness of this Doctrine in the Eyes of  
 “ *Worldly Wisdom*—we are assured by  
 “ God himself that the *Wisdom of this*  
 “ *World is Foolishness*, &c. What can be  
 “ more contrary to worldly Greatness, and  
 “ Wisdom, than the *Doctrine of the Cross*?  
 “ &c. † Had there been ANY OTHER LAW-  
 “ FUL WAY of *employing our Wealth*, than  
 “ in the ASSISTANCE OF THE POOR, our  
 “ Saviour would not have confined the  
 “ young Man in the Gospel to that *one*  
 “ Way of employing *all that he had*.”

If I am not greatly mistaken, it now ap-  
 pears that our Author is not *far* from as-  
 serting that ALL *Christians*, in ALL AGES,  
 are obliged to *sell all they have, and give*  
*it to the Poor*. Yet he positively affirms,  
 he is *so far* from asserting this; that he has  
 with *all his Might* said and proved the di-  
 rect contrary, that *no* Christians, of *any*  
 Age, are obliged to it. This Latter we are  
 now, in the next place, to consider. “ I have  
 “ shewn

\* P. 112, 113.

† P. 134.

“ shewn (says he \*) by *Variety of Arguments*  
 “ and *Texts of Scripture*, that that Com-  
 “ mand calls no rich Man to *sell* what he  
 “ has; that it calls him only to do that  
 “ with his Estate, which he is called to  
 “ by the whole Tenour of Scripture; as  
 “ having Riches, that are not his own, of  
 “ which he is only a Steward, &c.” I an-  
 swer, First, Suppose this were true; he  
 does but *contradict himself* again: Since  
 (as we have seen) he has in *many Places*,  
 and in the *strongest Terms*, asserted that *all*  
*Christians* are obliged to *sell* what they have,  
 &c. without any *Limitation, Distinction,*  
 or *Explanation* whatsoever. He should  
 have *explain'd* his Meaning, and *limited*  
 his Assertion, *at first*; if *at all*: But in-  
 stead of that, he uses the Word *sell* as every  
 body else does, for six and twenty Pages  
 together; then comes with a Kind of *Salvo*,  
 which Nobody knows what to make of.—  
 “ † *Sell*, i. e. renounce the *Self-Enjoyment*  
 “ of his Estate.—*Selling all* is only a  
 “ *Circumstance* of parting with the *Enjoy-*  
 “ *ment*, &c.—He sufficiently *sellet* *all*,  
 “ who parteth with the *Self-Enjoyment* of  
 “ it.—*Selling all* is only particular in  
 “ the Expression; but that Thing required  
 “ is the general Temper of Christianity;  
 “ as is express'd by being *dead to the World*,  
 “ *having our Conversation in Heaven*, &c.”  
 This

\* Answ. P. 106. † *Christ. Perf.* P. 114, 115, 118.



This *may* be called *explaining one's self*; but *should*, I think, be rather call'd *contradicting one's self*. “\* From the Beginning to the End of this Matter (says he) “ I have UTTERLY REJECTED ALL SELLING; and shewn that it means only, “ &c.” That is, he over and over, and in the fullest Expressions, asserted *selling all*, for six and twenty Pages together: Then adds a *few Lines* pretended to *explain*, but rather *contradicting* that Assertion: And this is UTTERLY REJECTING *all selling*, FROM THE BEGINNING TO THE END. And why does he reject *all selling*? Before he was for *selling all*; and now (*explaining himself* belike) he is against *all selling*. Must a Christian *sell nothing*? Secondly, *Where are we to find this Variety of Arguments, and Texts of Scripture*; by which he has *shewn* “ that that Command calls “ no rich Man to *sell* what he has?” Among this *Variety* of Arguments, and Texts, I cannot see *one* Argument, or *one* Text: And yet I have search'd very carefully. Why does he not *quote the Pages* where they are to be found? I might well ask the same Question, as to what goes before, and what is to follow. He *says* he *says* this, and that; but *never* tells us *where*. Is this *fair*? Is this the Way of *Controversy*? Thirdly, How does he

O

*prove*

\* Answ. P. 106.

prove that the Command of *selling all* implies *only such heavenly Affection, such Disregard of Riches, &c.* Just as he proves every thing else; he *says* it. Here, forsooth, whoever shall oppose him must enter into a formal Dispute with him about the Sense of the Word *Sell*: But indeed I shall not. The Sense of it is well known; and our Saviour, in his Discourse with the rich young Man, is, I believe, by All, but this Writer, suppos'd to have us'd it in its *common, strict, literal* Signification; whatever his Design was, whether only to *try* him, or really to *advise* him. "I have" (says our Author) *utterly rejected all* "Selling, and shewn that it means *only* a" "perfect Charity, a Parting with the *Self-*" "*Enjoyment, &c.*" He has *shewn* no such thing; but only *said* it: as I have been very often forced to observe concerning his Way of *shewing*, or *proving*. That fantastical Expression *the Self-Enjoyment of*—I took notice of in my Discourse; and a most fantastical, and ridiculous one it is. The *Self-Enjoyment* of a Glass of Wine; the *Self-Enjoyment* of a Peach—So in another Place, *Self-Pleasure*. I might here well enough ask, how he *proves* that we may not *self-enjoy* any thing of this World, or have some *Self-Pleasure* from it; if we must use those quaint Phrases. But of This hereafter. He adds; " \* The Doctor there-

“ fore in this Accufation must be allowed  
 “ to have stuck closely to his Text; he has  
 “ not *been righteous over-much.*” A smart  
 Saying, no doubt; and let him, by all means,  
 have the *Self-Enjoyment* of it.

“ \* The Doctor (continues he) makes  
 “ now an Inference, or two, from this  
 “ Doctrine of Charity.” Those which he  
 calls *Inferences of mine*, are his *own direct*  
*Doctrines.* “ *According to this Divinity,*  
 “ *it is a Sin to be rich.*” It is so; He  
 teaches this Doctrine in Substance, tho’ not  
 in those very Words; as I shall shew im-  
 mediately. “ Here he is just as wrong as  
 “ he could possibly be.” Very *positive*,  
 and *decretory* That; but let us see how *true*  
 it is. “ For, according to the Divinity in  
 “ THE Book of *Christian Perfection*, and  
 “ THE *Serious Call*, the Blessedness, the  
 “ Piety, the Happiness, arising from the  
 “ Possession of Riches, is demonstrated from  
 “ Chapter to Chapter, and visibly painted  
 “ in a great Variety of Characters. Those  
 “ *two Books* were publish’d chiefly to shew  
 “ *rich Men* their exceeding Happiness.”  
 His *Serious Call*, as I said Before, I never  
 read; and never will read. In his *Chri-*  
*stian Perfection* I can find nothing like this.  
 If what he here sets forth were the *chief*  
*Design* of that Book; ’tis much that no  
 mention should be made of it in the very

*Title-Page*, or in the *Contents* of some one *Chapter* at least. Yet I cannot see any thing of it in Either, nor in any one Page of his Book. Why does he not *quote* the *Passages*, if there be any such; or at least *refer* us to them in the Margin? But admitting it were as he says; he would only *contradict* himself again: For that *it is a Sin to be rich*, is plainly a Doctrine of his *Christian Perfection*. “ \* It is as found in  
 “ Divinity, (says he) as well founded in  
 “ Reason, to assert that our Saviour had  
 “ only Regard to his *first Disciples*, when  
 “ he said, *Ye cannot serve God, and Mam-*  
 “ *mon*, as when he saith, *Whosoever he be*  
 “ *of you that forsaketh not all that he hath,*  
 “ *he cannot be my Disciple*. For let any  
 “ one think, if he can find the least Sha-  
 “ dow of a Reason, why Christians should  
 “ *at first* be call’d to higher, &c.—than  
 “ *they are now*.” So that Christians, in  
 all Ages, are *obliged to forsake all they*  
*have*; nay they cannot be Christians, with-  
 out it: And if so; it is certainly *a Sin to*  
*be rich*. “ † If the *Kingdom of God* is not  
 “ *Riches* sufficient for us, but we must add  
 “ another Greatness, and *another Wealth* to  
 “ it; we fall under the *Condemnation* of  
 “ this Parable.” See also the two first Pa-  
 ragraphs of the same Page. So again; “ ‡ I  
 “ have, I think, sufficiently shewn that  
 “ our

\* P. 83.

† P. 99.

‡ P. 112.



“ our Saviour requir’d an *entire Renunciation of the World*” in general. And elsewhere \* he presses “ the *Renunciation of Riches*” in particular.

I here only observe further, that whereas in many Places † he *absolutely condemns all worldly Enjoyments* in general, or the *Enjoyment of Riches* in particular; we may well ask how he *proves* such Enjoyments to be unlawful. The Apostle says *God gives us all things richly to enjoy*, 1 Tim. vi. 17. We may *exceed* in these Enjoyments, ’tis true, and be guilty of great Sin by so doing: But how comes this Man *utterly* to forbid *all* worldly Enjoyments? He never *distinguishes* about *Degrees*, and other *Circumstances*; but, in his usual way, runs rambling on, without any distinct, determinate Meaning. Pursuing his Assertion that he never taught that *it is a Sin to be rich*, he adds; (*Answ. P. 107.*) “ And I “ can consistently say, that I should reckon “ it a Happiness to myself to be one of the “ Number, [*i. e.* of *rich Men* ;] support- “ ed only by this one Saying, that *it is “ more blessed to give than to receive.*” Others perhaps may be as sensible of the *Blessedness of Giving*, as He: And might say so with as much Truth; but they *will not*: Because they take it to be contrary to the Spirit of Christianity. They will not  
sound

\* P. 86.

† P. 99, 100, 101, 102, & *passim*.

sound a Trumpet to the Acts of Charity they would do, any more than to those they have done. His next Words are these.

“ \* Another Inference the Doctor makes  
 “ is this ; that according to this Divinity,  
 “ if a Man sues, you for your House, or  
 “ Land, without the least Pretence of  
 “ Right ; you are bound to recede from your  
 “ Right, and let him have it, rather than  
 “ defend it. There had been as much  
 “ Truth, and more Wit, if HE had said,  
 “ &c.” If I had said ? What have I to  
 do with it ? How comes he to throw his  
 own false, and foolish Doctrine upon Me ?  
 I only said HE said it ; and so he did, in  
 Substance, tho’ not in the very Words. And  
 there is indeed neither Truth, nor Wit in  
 it ; but palpable Falshood, asserted without  
 either Wit, or Judgment. — “ If HE had  
 “ said, when Thieves have any Design of  
 “ entering into your House, you are obliged  
 “ to have no Locks, or Bolts upon your  
 “ Doors. [By the way, how is there more  
 Wit, than Truth in this Stuff ; which is his  
 own, not mine ? It is EQUALLY false, and  
 witless. But I suppose He thought That  
 sharp Expression “ there had been as much  
 “ Truth, and more Wit, sounded prettily.]  
 “ ——— For I have said no more of the  
 “ Unlawfulness of appealing to Courts of  
 “ Justice,” &c. And so proceeds, declaring  
 himself

himself in Favour of *going to Law* in Defence of one's Property. I answer he *has* said *much more* of the *Unlawfulness* of *appealing to Courts of Justice* than he here pretends. And what he here says in *Favour* of it, is but another Instance of his *contradicting himself*. "If (says he\*) we see they [the first Christians] were call'd to——*Renouncing their own Rights*, we may judge amiss if we think this was *their particular Duty*." Again; "† We are to deny ourselves in *not defending ourselves by Suits at Law*; and must *take up the Cross* of one *Injury* after another, *rather than appeal* to the *Contention of a Trial*." And taking those Expressions of our Saviour's about the *Coat*, and the *Cloak*, in the *strict, literal* Sense, he subjoins; ‡ "The Words which deliver this Doctrine are so very *plain*, and *express*, that they need no *Illustration*." It is as plain also that they equally belong to *all Christians, in all Ages*." Our Saviour's Words, he affirms, need no *Illustration*; and I affirm they *do* need *Illustration*, and *Explanation* too: And He himself would have explain'd them as I do in my Discourse, according to the Sense of all learned Expositors, and sober judicious Christians; if he had not taken them in the *literal*, and *strictest* Signification, as forbidding

\* *Christ. Perf.* P. 80, 81.    † P. 193.    ‡ *Ibid*

bidding *all* Defence of Property by *going to Law*. What follows will shew that I have Reason for my Assertion. "Nor is it possible (says he \*) for any one to evade the *literal*, and open Meaning of these Doctrines, but in such a way as must destroy the Sense of any other Part of Scripture. If it could be shewn that we are not *obliged* by the *plain*, and *express* Doctrine of these Passages, it may as well be shewn that the next Doctrine—*Love your Enemies*, &c. does not oblige us in the *plain*, and *literal* Sense of the Words." And afterwards, "† It is not therefore spiteful Prosecutions, but the *most seemingly reasonable Self-Defence*, that is here forbidden." With much more in the two last cited Pages. In the last indeed he says: "If Christians will still think that they may defend *ALL* their Rights, &c. they are as much mistaken as if, &c." Here, if his Words have any distinct Meaning, he teaches that Christians may not defend *all* their Rights, but must recede from *some* of them: Which who denies? But he had before *absolutely* condemn'd *all* Self-Defence of this Kind; as I have fully shewn. So that *Before* we were to defend *none* of our Rights; *Now* we are allow'd to defend *some*: Which may be added to the rest of his

\* *Christ. Perf.* P. 193, 194. † P. 195.



his *Self-Contradictions*. In his *Answer*, P. 109. he goes on thus. "The Doctor *might have observ'd* that I spoke of *Law-Suits* only under the Article of *Self-Denial*, &c." What occasion had I to observe under what *Article* he spoke This? Or to weigh his Words with *so much* Accuracy and Exactness; when he wrote them without *any*? He *says* what I *quote*, and *just* as I *quote* it. What if he makes it an Instance of *Self-Denial* to defend *none* of our Rights; if *such Self-Denial* be our *Duty*, as he represents it? Tho', after all, he has a Passage in his *Christian Perfection*, which cuts off this Pretence of *Self-Denial*. " \* It is pretended by some, that these Passages only forbid the Prosecution of *spightful*, and *malicious* Suits at Law. But such People might as well pretend that the Eighth Commandment forbids only *wanton*, and *malicious* Stealing; but allows it when it is done soberly, and with no *spightful* Intention." Is to abstain from *Stealing* then an Instance of *Self-Denial*? Mighty *Self-Denial* truly. I always imagin'd that *Self-Denial*, in its highest, and principal Sense at least, had consisted in abstaining from Things in themselves *innocent*, and *lawful*, purely for the sake of *Mortification*; not in abstaining from the most *flagitious Crimes*, of which *Theft*, or *Robbery*, is certainly one.

P

'Tis

'Tis hard upon me, I think; that, in disputing with This Writer, I should be at so much Pains to prove, that I do *not* say what I do *not* say, and that he *does* say, what he *does* say; and also to follow him through the Maze in which he leads me, while, by an *After-Thought*, he is labouring to *annex some Meaning* to his *Words*.

He adds; “\* The Doctor has something like an *Excuse* for the *Weakness* and *Injustice* of *all* the foregoing Remarks, and Censures; they are to be consider'd only as *little Dashes* of his Pen upon Books which he says are *not considerable enough to be formally refuted*.” How *weak*, and *unjust* my Remarks have been, let the World judge: I think I have shewn both *Weakness*, and *Injustice* enough in *Him*. As to my saying that his *Christian Perfection*, and *such like* Books, especially others of his own, are *not considerable enough to be formally refuted*; I say the same still. I have partly in my *Discourse*, † partly in this *Reply* (see backwards, P. 83.) pointed out the *Sophisms*, and other *Absurdities*, upon which his false Doctrines, and wild Argumentations turn; and That is Answer sufficient. “Something like this, I remember, was formerly said by the Bishop of *Bangor*, now Lord Bishop of *Winchester*,

\* *Answ.* P. 109, 110.

† P. 22, 23.

“ *Winchester*, concerning my Letters to  
 “ him.” I remember Those Letters; I  
 read them, and lik’d them in the main;  
 The *Cause*, at least, in which he was en-  
 gaged was certainly good. But This Gen-  
 tleman is much *alter’d* since those Days. I  
 will intimate a Comparifon (which he need  
 not be afham’d of) between *Him*, and an  
 ancient Writer of great Parts, and Learn-  
 ing; who *once* wrote, and acted very well:  
 But *afterwards* he wrote, and acted very  
 ill, and foud Christians, in all Ages, both  
*in*, and *after* his Time, have made a great  
 Difinction between *Tertullian* the *Catho-  
 lick*, and *Tertullian* the *Montanift*. “ But  
 “ his Lordfhip had the *Prudence* and *E-  
 “ quity* not to make *inconfiderate* Remarks  
 “ upon Books that he thought not confi-  
 “ derable enough to be formally refuted by  
 “ him.” How *inconfiderate* my Remarks  
 have been, I leave to the Judgment of the  
 World again. “ Into whose Head could  
 “ it enter to think of *formally confuting*  
 “ *Thomas à Kempis*, *Taylor’s Life of*  
 “ *Chrift*, or his *Holy Living, and Dying*?  
 “ Or what muft we think of *his Piety*,  
 “ who fhould fay, that he only forbore  
 “ fuch a Work, becaufe the Reasonings in  
 “ Those Books were too inconfiderable to  
 “ be formally refuted?” The Gentleman  
 could not well have named four Books,  
 which I more read; and which, in the main,

I more love. I say *in the main*: For I think there are some *Inaccuracies*, and not quite true Doctrines, in *Thomas à Kempis* especially. "I desire no *Authority* for what "I have written, but the Gospel." That is, the Authority of the Gospel, interpreted HIS OWN WAY, *contrary to its plain Meaning*, (of which I have given some Instances) that is, again, *his own Authority*. — "Or I could shew that *every thing in my Book*, that offends the Doctor, is "again, and again to be found, not only "in *these pious Authors*, but in the Writings of the most *eminent Saints*, thro' "all Ages of the Church." This *He says*; and *This I deny*; and so we are even. As to the excellent Bishop *Taylor* in particular, That *Angel of a Man*, (for so He was, tho' he loads his Writings, his *Holy Living*, and *Dying*, especially, with a Multitude of Quotations from the *Greek*, and *Latin Poets*, nay has some from *Plays* themselves) whom to the last degree I love, and honour; I have here given one Instance (P. 65, 66.) to shew how contrary *his Doctrine* is to *This Gentleman's*: Many more I could produce, even out of That Book, his *Holy Living*: and more yet from his *Ductor Dubitantium*; which I take to be the *most judicious* of all his Works.

The last Words I quoted from my Adversary, are the last of his Pamphlet; and so I have



no more to say by way of *direct Reply*. Yet, here at the Close of all, it may not be improper to add a few Words more. This Gentleman has, with a very dictatorial Air, *advised* (and something more than advised) the *whole Body* of the *Clergy*; Me therefore, among the rest. Might I *presume* (as I do not) to advise *Him*; I would recommend to his serious Consideration the Nature, and Tendency of That *baneful Plague*, that Many-Headed Monster, ENTHUSIASM. If he duly examined it; he would find that, in all Ages, nothing has done more Mischief to Religion, and the Souls of Men, than *Enthusiasm*; That tho' Atheism may *in itself* be worse; yet *in Fact*, where *Atheism* has slain its Thousands, *Enthusiasm* has slain its Ten Thousands: That it has ever been the Pest of Learning, and the Introducer of Barbarism; that it has subverted States, and Kingdoms, and fill'd the World with Blood, and Confusion: That it has ever cloak'd the falsest, and most wicked *Principles*, the leudest, most immoral, and villanous *Practises*, with the *sainthy Show* of more than ordinary Religion: That the four *Elements* of this dark, fiery Soul, or fallen Nature, (as he elsewhere speaks \*) viz. a restless *Selfishness*, a restless *Envy*, a restless *Pride*, and a restless *Wrath*, or *Anger*,  
are

\* *Grounds and Reasons of Regeneration*, P. 34.

are no where found half so much as in *Enthusiasm*: That it comes from *Hell*, and to *Hell* it leads: That it is made up of *Pride*, (*Pride* especially; both *Spiritual*, and *Temporal*) of *Impudence*, and *Insolence*, *despising Dominions*, and *speaking evil of Dignities*; of the most unchristian *Censoriousness*, *Uncharitableness*, *Injustice*, *Lying*, *Calumny*, *Malice*, mortal *Hatred* against the *Establish'd Clergy* in particular; of *Canting*, *Jargon*, *Nonsense*, and *Blasphemy*: In a Word, that its *Reasonings* (if they may, without a *Solecism*, be call'd so) ever have been, and ever will be, the *Contempt* of all *Men of Sense*; and its *Doctrines* the *Abhorrence* of all *Christians*.



# APPENDIX



SOON after Mr. *Law's* Answer was publish'd, I received a Letter from a worthy Lay-Gentleman, to me utterly unknown: Part of which I think fit to subjoin in This Place. The rather; because he mentions certain Enthusiastick Writers, whose Names I never heard of Before, from whom he says Mr. *Law* borrows some of his strange Notions, and puts them off as his own. If this be so; 'tis *humble Plagiarism* indeed. There are, it is true, other Things in this Extract, (for it is no more) which I have largely consider'd in the foregoing Reply: Yet I insert them; because it will from hence appear, how obvious they are to Men of Judgment: Among whom This Gentleman is plainly One. I omit his many Expressions of personal Kindness to Me: For which, however, I heartily thank him.

Speaking of my Antagonist, he writes Thus.

I must confess in one respect, I think his Answer Unanswerable: For how it is possible

sible to reduce into any Form, such a Rambling, Immethodical, Enthusiastical, Rhapsodical, Impertinent, Unapplicable Set of Periods, I really cannot imagine. As to his *Nations* concerning the State of Things before the Creation of this visible Frame of the World, and of Man; I can say nothing to them, because I have no *Nation* of them. Tho' I may remark, that all Writers upon these speculative Subjects, want *Data* to go upon; and, that he in particular is inconsistent, and contradictory to himself; and, if I mistake not, to Scripture too. For in the Epistle of St. Jude, the fallen Angels are there spoken of, as having not *kept their first Estate, but having left their own Habitations*. There are several other Passages of Scripture, where the Devil is said to be *cast out*—*thrown down*, and the like; which at present I cannot recollect.

But I am the less surpris'd to find him inconsistent or absurd upon a Subject of so much Difficulty, when I find him scarce intelligible, in speaking to a plain Matter of Fact. For in his Censures upon that Passage, where you argue from that Miracle of our Lord's turning Water into Wine, *that something might be indulg'd to Pleasure and Chearfulness*; He, by endeavouring to take it out of your Hands, as he expresses himself, and explain it in a proper



perer Manner, has really evaporated the Miracle into Nothing, by saying, it *was miraculously seeming better Wine*: Whereas the Text is positive, and the Governor of the Feast says to the Bridegroom, *Thou hast kept the good Wine until now*; not seemingly good, I suppose, but in *Truth* and *Reality* better than what they had before. Had such an Argument come from the Pen of an Infidel in Disguise, in order to elude the convincing Force and Truth of that Miracle, I should not have been surprised: But that it should come from the Pen of one, whom I believe to be the Reverse of that Character, betrays, in my Opinion, a total Absence of good Judgment and *sound Understanding*. And then after all, what a horrid, what a hideous Exclamation does he make about your Words? As if you had really blasphemed the *Lord*, and denied the Living God. But this, Sir, is the certain Consequence, and fatal Effect of a Mind given up to visionary Enthusiasm. And what else can be expected from those who read *Jacob Bhemen*, *P. Por-dage*, and *Mrs. Lead*, and other Writers of that Stamp, with almost the same Veneration and implicit Faith, that other People read the Scriptures? What but a false Bias of Mind, an Enthusiastical Turn of Thought, a Spiritualizing away the Reason and Substance of the Christian Religion?

Q

And

And agreeably to the natural Effect of such Opinions, how ridiculous, how absurd is his Pamphlet throughout! What Exclamations, what Admonitions, what Reprehensions, what impracticable Schemes are jumbled together! And then what insolent Liberties does he take, in pretending to chastise the whole Body of the Clergy in general, and yourself in particular! I must confess, if I had not read your Sermons, I should have thought them, by his Account, a most scandalous, immoral, prophane Performance: Rather a Dehortation from, than an Exhortation to, *true Religion*. Beside this, I might remark upon his Flings at other Persons of eminent Character, particularly Dr. *Waterland*; when he spurns at the Expression *Federal Rite*, which the Doctor has applied to Baptism; and having Recourse, forsooth, to *Criticks* and *Commentators*. Now, Sir, I believe the Doctor understands the *Grounds* and *Reasons* of *Baptism*, and *Christian Regeneration*, every whit as well as Mr. *Law*. And the Doctor has most judiciously shewn some Men their Error, by telling them, that instead of talking of *Regeneration*, and *Feelings*, and *Experiences*, they should have exhorted People to *repent*; for *regenerated* they were before, at their Baptism.—I must own, Mr. *Law* once appear'd to me in a very different  
 Light

Light from what he does now. He distinguish'd himself early, and with Reputation, against Bishop *Hoadly*. But ever since that, he has been declining, and dwindling, down to the Meanness of a *Methodist*. This Gentleman too it is, I am told, that originally set up those People, and has been, *remotely*, the Occasion of all this *Disturbance*; I think little to his Credit.

There is *one thing* more occurs to my Thoughts, which is more *flagrant* than all the rest. He pretends to charge you with omitting those *Rules, Precepts, and Instructions*, necessary to guide your Congregations in the Way of true Religion; making your Discourse nothing but a mere Declamation against being *Righteous over-much*; charging them not to be too *strict* in their *Notions*, and to let their *Religion*, set as *easy* upon them as they can. Such monstrous Disingenuity, Falshood, and Misrepresentation, I never saw before. Who can think, or believe, that he could have his Senses or Understanding about him, or that he understood one Word, while he was reading your Discourse? Was it not manifestly design'd to guard *them* against those false and vicious *Appearances* of Religion, who want the *Reality* of it? Was it not to prevent their Delusion; and to caution them against the dangerous Excesses of *Enthusiasm*, which always hath been, and

always will be, the *Pest* and *Bane* of *true Religion*? And do you not, before you conclude, most *pathetically* exhort them, to avoid the other Extreme of *Carelesness*, and *Neglect* of the Great, the *Strict*, the Indispensable Duties of Religion, properly so called? Do you not, in the most tender and modest Manner, appeal to your Auditory to testify, *how often you have, with the greatest Earnestness, insisted* upon every Christian Duty? And yet this Gentleman has the Face, the Confidence (what shall I call it?) the Baseness, to charge you with omitting all these Particulars, Must you, in order to convince this unaccountable Zealot, publish all the Discourses you have preach'd throughout the long Course of your Ministry? But I forbear. He sets out, at the Beginning of his Pamphlet, with great boasting of his *Love towards Mankind*; but I think, in the following Parts of it, he has given a pregnant Proof of the contrary. What Man of true Humanity could have prevail'd with himself to censure, at so unmerciful a rate, the whole Body of the Clergy; and represent them all, without Distinction, as mere Apostates? Charging the Vice, Infidelity, and Prophaneness that now reigns, upon *their Examples*; or a *total Neglect* of the most important Duties of the sacred Function: As if they were all become *true Sons* of old  
*Eli,*



*Eli*, or rather *Priests of Baal*? And herein he seems to have copied, but with Amplification, his glorious *Disciple, Whitefield*; who in his Preface to his Sermon of Regeneration, has tax'd the Clergy with *failing, out of a servile Fear, to declare the whole Will of God; and suffering their Congregations to rest satisfied with the Shell and Shadow of Religion.* Is this Love towards Mankind? Is this Christianity? Is this Humanity? No, but it is *Methodism* — If a Clergyman becomes responsible for the Sins of his Parish; if he must bear the Punishment due to the Iniquity committed; what must the poor *Minister of C——t G——n* do? That Sink of Vice, Lewdness, and Prophaneness! And yet nothing, at least that I know of, is wanting in that Gentleman to prevent it, either in Doctrine, or Example. The good *Rector of St. J——s*, I believe does his utmost to hinder the Progress of every Immorality; and yet I am told, there are two or three most *abominable Clubs* within his Parish: And must *he* answer for all the Sin and Wickedness committed amongst them? Indeed the Argument is so preposterous, that barely to repeat it, is a sufficient Confutation of it — Were there not the worst of Opinions and Practices even in the Times of the Apostles? Did not *Simon Magus*, and his Followers, profess and practice almost

most all Sorts of impurities? And was any thing wanting in the Apostles to discourage or suppress them? Did not several Meetings and Assemblies of Christians become very scandalous, particularly the *Feasts of Love*, which were defil'd with the Commission of great, and grievous Sin? And yet, must all these Enormities be charg'd upon the *Teachers* or *Pastors* of those Times? But to pursue the Argument further would be quite nauseous.

He calls his Pamphlet an *Answer* to your Discourse concerning the *Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger* of being *Righteous over-much*. But how it can in Truth and Reality be so called, I cannot imagine. He begins with great Boasting of his Love and Benevolence towards Mankind; and in Consequence of that, He undertakes to expose the dangerous Errors of your Performance, to correct your false Account of being *Righteous over-much*, and to shew, you made it your Business to persuade Mankind to let their Religion sit upon them as easy as they can. But how, or in what Manner he has perform'd this notable Task, let *Common Sense* be the Judge. Were there not here and there a Sentence of yours inserted in his Pamphlet, I could not, I would not, believe he had read your Discourse. By *Omitting*, and *Adding*, by *Misrepresenting*, and *Perverting*, in a most intolerable

rable Manner, the plain and manifest Sense  
 of your Words, he has charg'd upon them  
 such monstrous Consequences, as no Man,  
 I think, in his *right Wits*, could ever have  
 thought of. And then to make up for your  
*Deficiencies*, forsooth, he has furnish'd his  
 Reader with a Set of Chimerical Notions,  
 concerning the *State of Things before the*  
*Fall of Angels*; for which he has no Au-  
 thority but *Jacob Bhemen*, out of whom  
 all his fine Fancies are extracted; and has  
 the Modesty to soist upon the World those  
 Opinions, as his own, which he has plainly  
 borrowed from others. I must subjoin, that  
 I am no *Clergyman*; am no ways a Party  
 interested, or concerned; but a *Well-wisher*  
 to *Truth*, to those *sacred Truths*, which  
 you have asserted; and a *Well-wisher* to  
*yourself*. And nothing else could have pre-  
 vail'd with me to give you all this Trouble.

*I am*

*Your most Obedient,*

*Tho' Unknown Servant,*

PHILO-CLERICUS.

F I N I S.

table. After the plain and manifest  
of your words, he has charged upon them  
these monstrous Conclusions, as if I had  
I think, in his right Way, could ever have  
thought of. And then to make up for your  
Omission, he has furnished his  
Reader with a list of Chinese  
concerning the State of Yunnan, &c. &c.  
Part of which, for which he has no  
authority, but from the same  
all his fine Fancies are extracted; and has  
the boldness to tell upon the World those  
Opinions as his own, which he has plainly  
borrowed from others.

ERRATA.

P. 17. l. 3. instead of [.] make it [1] P. 40. l. 3.  
for lost read left. P. 43. l. 23. read deepest. P. 44.  
l. 25. after [.] add [1] P. 62. l. 13. read such. P.  
64. l. 1. read Whoever. l. 30. read upon. P. 115. l.  
12. after ill, add [1]





3-14-P-7